

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

SCOTT A. KONITZER,
a/k/a Donna Dawn Konitzer,

Plaintiff,

v.

GARY HAMBLIN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

11-cv-426-slc

On May 30, 2013, this court received plaintiff's handwritten request for still another extension of her deadline to respond to defendants' motion for summary judgment, this time to mid-June. Dkt. 229. Plaintiff assures that she "will not seek any further extensions beyond that point barring any impeding plaintiff by the defendants." *Id.* at 3. Of course, this qualifier renders plaintiff's assurance meaningless. In this same request for an extension, plaintiff takes issue with defendants' "evasive discovery responses" and asks for a teleconference to address these issues. *Id.* at 4. Then on May 31, 2013, the court received plaintiff's neatly typed "renewed expedited motion to stay dispositive motions deadline pursuant to FRCP 56(f)," dkt. 231, which takes strong issue with discovery responses the defendants provided on or about May 13, 2013, *see* dkt. 230 and attachments.

This court already has ruled several times that plaintiff's complaints about the adequacy and truthfulness of defendants' discovery responses are, with minuscule exceptions, insufficient to obtain additional extensions of her response deadline under Rule 56(d). *See, e.g.*, March 22, 2013 Order, dkt. 208; April 22, 2103 Order, dkt. 225. I have lost track of the number of times I have told plaintiff that the latest deadline extension is her "final" extension, only to have plaintiff present a new situation and new excuse in support of her request for yet another extension.

Plaintiff is not going to get a stay or another extension based on her untimely, endless and unpersuasive claims of discovery abuses by the defendants. Because of her self-reports of continued hand pain (unsupported by any medical records or affidavits from a treatment provided) I will give plaintiff until June 14, 2013 to file her complete response to defendants' pending summary judgment motion. If Plaintiff does not have her response in the mail stream by June 14, 2013, then defendants' motion is under advisal to the court. If she does respond, then defendants have two weeks after the response is filed within which to file their reply.

Given plaintiff's almost pathological avoidance of providing a substantive response to defendants' January 14, 2013 summary judgment motion, it would be in character for her to manufacture another reason for another continuance. We're past that. June 14, 2013 is her truly final deadline.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that:

(1) Plaintiff's motion to extend her deadline to file a response to defendants summary judgment motion, dkt. 229, is granted. Plaintiff's truly final deadline is June 14, 2013. Defendants' deadline to reply is 14 days after plaintiff's response is received by the court.

(2) Plaintiff's expedited motion to stay, dkt. 231, is DENIED.

Entered this 31st day of May, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge