

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

CHAZ GULLEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

SEMPLE, et al.,
Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO. 3:16-cv-425 (MPS)

JULY 13, 2016

RULING AND ORDER

The plaintiff and the defendants each filed a motion on June 27, 2016. The defendants seek an extension of time, *nunc pro tunc*, until July 1, 2016, to respond to the complaint. The plaintiff has filed a motion seeking to compel and sanction the defendants pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11.

Rule 11(c) permits the court to impose sanctions only for violation of Rule 11(b), which sets forth certifications that are made when an attorney or unrepresented party signs and presents a pleading, motion or other paper to the court. The plaintiff seeks to sanction the defendants for failure to timely respond to his complaint. As his motion does not concern any certifications included in section 11(b), sanctions pursuant to Rule 11(c) are not warranted. The plaintiff's motion is denied.

The defendants seek an extension of time to respond to the complaint. Rule 7(b)1, D. Conn. L. Civ. R., permits the Clerk to grant an initial motion for extension of time to respond to the complaint, not exceeding thirty days. All other requests for extension of time must be supported by a showing of good cause. D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 7(b)2. In this case, the defendants' response was due on June 5, 2016, sixty days from April 6, 2016, the day waiver forms were

mailed to the defendants. As the date requested, July 1, 2016, is within thirty days of the original deadline, a showing of good cause is not required. The defendant's motion is granted. The Court notes that the defendants' filed their answer on June 30, 2016.

In conclusion, the plaintiff's motion to compel and sanction [ECF No. 15] is **DENIED** and the defendants' motion for extension of time *nunc pro tunc* [ECF No. 14] is **GRANTED**.

SO ORDERED this 13th day of July 2016 at Hartford, Connecticut.

/s/
Michael P. Shea
United States District Judge