UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HAROLD WEISBERG and JAMES H. LESAR,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Civil Action No. 86-1547

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendant.

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Defendant respectfully moves the Court to extend its time to reply to plaintiff's opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment, from November 21, 1986 to and including December 19, 1986. We are authorized to state that plaintiff's counsel does not oppose this motion.

We regret the length of the extension sought, but it is made necessary by the schedule of defendant's counsel principally responsible for this case, as summarized below.

Since receipt of plaintiff's opposition on November 13, 1986, said counsel has had lengthy motions and memoranda to file in various cases on November 13, 14 and 17, 1986. He is scheduled to file other previously scheduled, substantial motions and memoranda in various cases on November 24, 25, 28 and December 1, 1986.

Said counsel has depositions scheduled for November 24 and 25, December 4 and 5, and December 10 and 11, 1/ and an

1/ While it is possible that these depositions will not consume six full days, counsel has set aside that time because there is a substantial likelihood that they may. <u>en banc</u> argument in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on December 1, 1986. The depositions on December 4 and 5 are to be held in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Based on these circumstances, defendant respectfully requests an extension of time until December 19, 1986 within which to reply to plaintiff's opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH E. DIGENOVA, D.C. Bar #073320 United States Attorney

ROYCE C. LAMBERTH, D.C. Bar #189761 Assistant United States Attorney

Woald an

NATHAN DODELL, D.C. Bar #131920 Assistant United States Attorney

ι,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing motion for extension of time to reply to plaintiff's opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment and proposed order was mailed to plaintiff's attorney, James H. Lesar, Esquire, 918 F Street, N.W., Suite 509, Washington, D.C. 20004, this 19th day of November, 1986.

NATHAN DODELL Assistant United States Attorney Judiciary Center Building 555 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 272-9202

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HAROLD WEISBERG and JAMES H. LESAR,

Plaintiffs,

Defendant.

v.

· ~

Civil Action No. 86-1547

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

ORDER

Upon consideration of defendant's motion for an extension of time to reply to plaintiff's opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment, it is by the Court, this _____ day of November, 1986,

ORDERED that defendant shall have to and including December 19, 1986 within which to reply to plaintiff's opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE