

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

**NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA, INC., et al.,**

Plaintiffs,

V.

VILLAGE OF OAK PARK.

Defendants.

No. 08 C 3696

Judge Milton I. Shadur
Magistrate Judge Keys

**DEFENDANT’S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND THE
SCHEDULE FOR COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 54.3(D)**

Defendant Village of Oak Park (the “Village”), by its attorney, Mayer Brown LLP, respectfully requests that the Court extend the schedule set by the Court in its Order dated July 14, 2011 for compliance with Local Rule 54.3(d) by two weeks. In support thereof, the Village states:

1. On July 14, 2011, the Court entered an Order setting the following schedule for the parties to comply with Local Rule 54.3(d): (i) Plaintiffs were to submit the information required by Local Rule 54.3(d)(1)-(4) by August 5, 2011; (ii) Defendant is to comply with Local Rule 54.3(d)(5) by September 12, 2011; (iii) the parties are to file their joint statement by October 31, 2011; and (iv) Plaintiffs' motion for attorneys' fees is due by November 21, 2011.

2. Plaintiffs submitted to the Village the information required by Local Rule 54.3(d)(1)-(4) on August 5, 2011. Plaintiffs's submission is 322 pages and contains affidavits, curriculum vitae, and detailed billing records for five different firms working on the matter.

3. Although the Village's information under Local Rule 54.3(d)(5) is due on September 12, 2011, the Village requires an additional two weeks, to and including September 26, 2011, to

provide Plaintiffs with its information, which includes “any evidence” the Village will use to oppose the fees requested by Plaintiffs. *See* L.R. 54.3(d)(5)(D).

4. Since receiving Plaintiffs’ submission, the Mayer Brown LLP attorney assigned to this matter has been working with counsel for the City of Chicago to complete expert disclosures in *Pacholski, et al. v. City of Chicago, et al.*, No. 10 C 4184, currently pending before Judge Edmond E. Chang. This work has required extensive and time-consuming travel. In addition, the Village’s attorney in this matter is working on other pressing matters in the Circuit Court of Cook County, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin and U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Moreover, because Mayer Brown LLP is pro bono counsel to the Village, the records of its time and expenses in relation to the defense of this matter to be produced pursuant to under Local Rule 54.3(d)(5)(A),(C) are not kept in the ordinary course and take considerable time to generate from accounting databases. As a result of the foregoing work assignments and the difficulty of producing the requested records, the Village requires an additional two weeks to review Plaintiffs’ voluminous submission and to submit their information under Local Rule 54.3(d)(5) to Plaintiffs.

5. Additionally, the Village is coordinating some aspects of its defense of this matter with the City’s defense in the related *National Rifle Association of America, Inc., et al. v. City of Chicago, et al.*, No. 08 C 3697—specifically the identification of “any evidence” the Village will use to oppose the fees requested by Plaintiffs pursuant to Local Rule 54.3(d)(5)(D). The Village’s counsel has conferred with the defendants’ attorneys in *National Rifle Association of America, Inc., et al. v. City of Chicago*, No. 08-CV-3697, and they likewise will be filing a motion to extend the Local Rule 54.3(d) schedule by two weeks. As their motion states, City attorneys assigned to that

matter were all on pre-planned vacations in late August and have been engaged in other pressing matters. As a result, the City requires an additional two weeks to review Plaintiffs' voluminous submission and to submit their information under Local Rule 54.3(d)(5) to Plaintiffs. The Village is requesting the same extension to facilitate coordination with the City and maintain an orderly schedule for Plaintiffs in both matters, which are the same.

6. Counsel for the Village conferred with counsel for Plaintiffs on September 8 regarding this request for extension, and Plaintiffs' counsel stated that they had no objection provided the remaining dates set in the Court's July 14, 2011 Order are likewise extended for an additional two weeks.

WHEREFORE, the Village respectfully requests that the Court extend: (i) the time for the Village to comply with Local Rule 54.3(d)(5) to September 26, 2011; (ii) the date for the parties to file their joint statement to November 14, 2011; and (iii) the date for Plaintiffs to file a motion for attorneys' fees to December 5, 2011, and grant the Village such further relief as the Court deems just an appropriate.

Date: September 9, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

VILLAGE OF OAK PARK

By: /s/Ranjit Hakim

Ranjit Hakim
MAYER BROWN LLP
71 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
312-701-8758 – Telephone
312-706-9124 - Facsimile
Attorney for Village of Oak Park