

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

GREGORY T. ANGELO, ET AL.

Plaintiffs,

v.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ET AL.

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Civil Action No. 22-cv-1878 RDM

ORDER

(Proposed)

Before the Court is Defendants' motion for a 90-day extension of time to respond to Plaintiffs' application for preliminary injunction. Defendant also requests that the time to respond to Plaintiffs' complaint be held in abeyance until the Court rules on the preliminary injunction request. Plaintiffs consent to a 30-day extension conditioned on the Court granting Plaintiffs 30 days to reply to Defendants' response. Plaintiffs also consent to the Court holding the response date to their Complaint in abeyance pending the Court's ruling on the injunction request.

The Court finds that Defendants have failed to show a need beyond 30 days to prepare their response to Plaintiffs' application to preliminarily enjoin DC Code Section 7-2509.07(a)(6). Accordingly, the court will grant Defendants 30 additional days to respond to the injunction request, but not 90 days.

The Court will also hold Defendants' response date in abeyance pending ruling on the injunction.

IT IS ORDERED that Defendants shall file their response to Plaintiffs' preliminary injunction application on or before August 17, 2022, and Plaintiffs shall file their reply on or before September 16, 2022.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' response date to Plaintiffs' Complaint shall be held in abeyance pending the Court's ruling on Plaintiffs' preliminary injunction application.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____, 2022

Randolph D. Moss
District Court Judge