

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
(Northern Division)**

M.A.B., a minor,
by and through his parents and next friends,
L.A.B. and L.F.B.,
Plaintiff,

v.

**BOARD OF EDUCATION OF TALBOT
COUNTY, et al.,**
Defendants.

Civil Action No. **GLR-16-2622**

**JOINT REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF EXTENSION
OF DEADLINES SET FORTH IN STIPULATED BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

The parties, Plaintiff, M.A.B., by and through his undersigned counsel, and Defendants, the Board of Education of Talbot County, Kelly L. Griffith, and Tracy Elzey, by and through their undersigned counsel, in line with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A), and the Court's Approval of the Parties' Stipulated Briefing Schedule (ECF 35) hereby respectfully submit the following joint request for approval of an extension of the deadlines set forth in this Court's stipulated briefing schedule. In support of this request, the parties state the following:

1. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint on April 18, 2017. By operation of Local Rule 105.2(a), plaintiff's response in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss is due on May 2, 2017. Additionally, plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction is due, by stipulation, on May 1, 2017.

2. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A), if an act may or must be done within a specified time, the Court may, for good cause, extend a time for reply if "a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires[.]" Here, Jennifer Kent, counsel for plaintiff, recently suffered a back injury on April 22, 2017. Additionally, on April 25, 2017, Ms. Kent learned of a

personal emergency that will force her to take leave for an estimated time period of one week. Given Ms. Kent's recent back injury, an emergency requiring her to take unexpected time off of work, and the added complexity of managing FreeState Justice's in house case load with limited staff resources, counsel requires additional time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss.

3. Plaintiff's counsel has conferred with counsel for defendant, who has agreed to an extension of the stipulated deadlines so that both papers (plaintiff's response in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss and plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction) would be filed no later than May 20, 2017. The response and reply times for these motions will continue to be governed by Local Rule 105.2.

4. The relief requested herein is for good cause and will not cause undue delay in this case moving forward. Plaintiff's counsel is cognizant of this Court's expressed timeline as it pertains to plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction, and extending plaintiff's deadline to respond will, in counsel's view, still make feasible a prompt resolution of plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction.

5. A proposed Order is attached for the Court's consideration.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
(Northern Division)**

M.A.B., a minor,
by and through his parents and next friends,
L.A.B. and L.F.B.,
Plaintiff,

v.

**BOARD OF EDUCATION OF TALBOT
COUNTY, et al.,**
Defendants.

Civil Action No. **GLR-16-2622**

ORDER

In light of the parties' joint request for approval of an extension of the deadlines set forth in this Court's stipulated briefing schedule (ECF 35), the following schedule will govern the briefing of plaintiff's response in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss and plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction:

- Plaintiff's response in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss due: **May 20, 2017**
- Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction due: **May 20, 2017**

SO ORDERED, this _____ day of April, 2017.

George Levi Russell, III
United States District Judge