

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

THOMAS GULLICK,

Plaintiff,

v.

TERRY OTT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

06-C-707-C

---

The parties have filed a stipulation in which they attempt to extend their dispositive motion filing deadline in this case from August 3, 2007 to August 17, 2007. I am denying this request without prejudice.

One might surmise that a two-week difference on a motion deadline doesn't really make a difference, but in this court at least, it does. One reason that this court moves its civil cases so quickly is that it books its calendar four trials deep (plus three additional criminal trials). This court requires briefing in summary judgment motions to be complete three months before trial not because it will spend three months working on the motion, but because at any given time there are between 15 and 30 motions pending, all attached to firm trial dates. It's like air traffic control at O'Hare: to get the myriad jets into and out of the air on time, they all need to continue moving in a predictable direction at a pre-arranged speed. If one jet gets stuck at the terminal waiting for a late passenger, then it could sit for hours on the runway, if it takes off at all. In this court, the jets all leave on time.

The parties agreed to their schedule in early February. The summary judgment motion deadline still is 4½ weeks distant. Moving back the deadline even a bit cuts into the court's three month review window. The parties have not provided any reason for needing two extra weeks, let alone a reason the court would accept. So the request is denied and the deadline stands.

Entered this 26<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER  
Magistrate Judge