

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

AARON A. KREILKAMP,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROUNDY'S, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER

05-C-425-C

Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment in this case on February 3, 2006. In accordance with the magistrate judge's October 19, 2005 preliminary pretrial conference order, plaintiff has thirty days, or until March 6, 2006, in which to serve and file a response to the motion. (The 30th day actually falls on a Sunday, so the deadline is the next working day, a Monday.) Now plaintiff has written to request an enlargement of time to March 15, 2006, in which to oppose the motion. That request will be denied.

Plaintiff states that he already has read over defendant's submissions four times and wants to insure that he answers its "documents" correctly, but he suggests no reason why he cannot respond to defendant's proposed findings of fact by the March 6 deadline. The most critical task for plaintiff to accomplish is responding to defendant's proposed findings of fact.

It is far less important for him to prepare a brief setting out his view of the law, as it is ultimately the court's responsibility to apply the law correctly to plaintiff's case. Defendant proposed a total of 42 facts, each simply stated. If plaintiff disagrees with a proposed fact, he is to write, "Dispute," in response to the proposal and then state his version of the fact, followed by a reference to evidence he either is submitting or has submitted that proves his point. If plaintiff is diligent, there is no reason he cannot finish his response by the March 6 deadline.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an enlargement of time to March 15, 2006, in which to respond to defendant's motion for summary judgment is DENIED for plaintiff's failure to show cause why such an extension is necessary.

Entered this 17th day of February, 2006.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge