

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

THOMAS BROWN, individually, etc.,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) No. 06 C 617
)
 COUNTY OF COOK, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Counsel for plaintiff Thomas Brown in this putative class action has filed another motion for an extension of time to respond to defendants' motions to dismiss, a motion that counsel scheduled for presentment on January 3, 2008 and that this Court learned about only when--with the December 10 due date for such a response having passed without its having been received--it asked its minute clerk to run a printout of the case docket. Although the motion certainly establishes good cause for a further extension as requested, counsel's busy schedule reflected in the motion does not justify her having violated the two rules of this District Court that are intended (a) to apprise judges of the matters relevant to their management of cases on their dockets and (b) to facilitate the prompt handling of those matters:

1. LR 5.2(e) requires delivery of a paper copy of all electronically filed documents to the judge's chambers within one business day after the filing--something that was not done here.

2. LR 5.3(b) requires that the presentment date for any motion must not be scheduled beyond ten business days after the notice of presentment is filed.

This Court (1) grants the request in the motion for extension of the response date to December 31, 2007, (2) vacates the currently scheduled December 20 status hearing date and (3) replaces that date with a status hearing at 9 a.m. January 4, 2008. But consistently with this Court's website warning to counsel as to violations of LR 5.2(e) that necessitate the printing out of motion papers by this Court's minute clerk, counsel is ordered to pay \$14 to the Clerk of Court on or before December 26, 2007.¹



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: December 13, 2007

¹ This amount is larger than should have been the case, because on December 10 Brown's counsel also inexplicably filed as Dkt. 86 the selfsame document that had been filed on October 12 as Dkt. 77--the original motion for extension, and the minute clerk of course had no way of knowing that when she saw references to two December 10 docket filings and printed them out in toto.