

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION**

SAMUEL K. LIPARI,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 07-0849-CV-W-FJG
)	
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Currently pending before the Court are plaintiff’s Motions for an Extension of Time to Respond to the Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss (Docs. # 18, 21, 35). Plaintiff seeks permission to file a single consolidated response to the defendants’ four separate motions to dismiss. Plaintiff has also filed a Motion for Leave to exceed the page limitation for his consolidated response (Doc. # 40).

Defendants oppose plaintiff’s Motions for an Extension of Time because plaintiff initially did not request a specific time to respond and instead asked for twenty-three days from the date that the last motion to dismiss was filed. Defendants also argue that statements made in plaintiff’s second and third motions for an extension of time, regarding whether one of the defendants had been served contradict each other. Defendants also oppose the motions for extension because they believe that an omnibus response from plaintiff will greatly increase the likelihood that the individual arguments from the defendants will be lumped together and will not be specifically addressed by plaintiff.

After consideration of the parties’ positions, the Court hereby **GRANTS** plaintiff’s

Motions for Extension of Time (Docs. 18, 21 & 35). Plaintiff may file one consolidated response to the defendants' Motions to Dismiss, however, to the extent that the defendants have raised separate issues in their Motions to Dismiss, then plaintiff must specifically respond to these issues in his Suggestions in Opposition. Plaintiff's Consolidated Response to the Motions to Dismiss is hereby due on or before **April 14, 2008**. Plaintiff also requested leave to exceed the page limitation for his suggestions in opposition. Attached to his motion for leave to exceed the page limitation was a copy of his suggestions in opposition, which numbers sixty-three pages, not including the thirteen page table of contents and list of cases cited. None of the Motions to Dismiss exceeded over twenty pages and many of the defendants make similar arguments. The Court finds that sixty-three pages is excessive, even for a consolidated response. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Exceed the page limitation is hereby **GRANTED in part** (Doc. # 40). Plaintiff may file Consolidated Suggestions in Opposition, however the Suggestions in Opposition shall not exceed a total of thirty-five (35) pages.

Date: 4/7/08
Kansas City, Missouri

S/ FERNANDO J. GAITAN, JR.
Fernando J. Gaitan, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge