| | Case 2:08-cv-01633-NVW Document 617 | 7 Filed 09/24/09 Page 1 of 2 |
|--------|--|---|
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | TES DISTRICT COURT |
| 7 | FOR THE DISTR | RICT OF ARIZONA |
| 8 9 | Don Addington; John Bostic; Mark) Burman; Afshin Iranpour; Roger Velez;) Steve Wargocki, | No. CV 08-1633-PHX-NVW (consolidated) |
| 10 | Plaintiffs, | ORDER |
| 11 | vs. | |
| 12 | US Airline Pilots Association; US) | |
| 13 | Airways, Inc., | |
| 14 | Defendants. | |
| 15 | Don Addington; John Bostic; Mark) | CHOO 1500 PMW MWW |
| 16 | Burman; Afshin Iranpour; Roger Velez;) Steve Wargocki, et al., | CV08-1728-PHX-NVW |
| 17 | Plaintiffs, | |
| 18 | vs. | |
| 19 | Stavan Bradford: Dayl Diaria: Dahart | |
| 20 | Steven Bradford; Paul Diorio; Robert) Frear; Mark King; Douglas Mowery; John) Stephan, et al., | |
| 21 | Defendants. | |
| 22 | Detellualits. | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | Before the Court is Defendant USA | PA's First Motion to Extend Time to Answer |
| 25 | Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint. | (Doc. # 609.) The Motion is mooted by |
| 26 | Defendant's September 18, 2009 Answer to | the Second Amended Complaint. (Doc. # 616.) |

However, even if the Motion were not moot, the Court would have denied the Motion.

Though Defendant's time to file a motion to dismiss has been extended so as to not interfere

28

| with counsel's work on the appeal, there is benefit to pleading in response to the Second Amended Complaint so Plaintiff can plan its litigation. Preparing an answer would not be a significant burden on Defendant. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant USAPA's First Motion to Extend Time to Answer Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc. # 609) is denied as moot. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge United States District Judge United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 | | Case 2:08-cv-01633-NVW Document 617 Filed 09/24/09 Page 2 of 2 | | |
|---|----|---|--|--|
| Amended Complaint so Plaintiff can plan its litigation. Preparing an answer would not be a significant burden on Defendant. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant USAPA's First Motion to Extend Time to Answer Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc. # 609) is denied as moot. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | | | | |
| a significant burden on Defendant. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant USAPA's First Motion to Extend Time to Answer Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc. # 609) is denied as moot. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Wake United States District Judge | | | | |
| TI IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant USAPA's First Motion to Extend Time to Answer Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc. # 609) is denied as moot. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | | | | |
| Time to Answer Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc. # 609) is denied as moot. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge United States District Judge 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 3 | | | |
| DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. Neil V. Wake United States District Judge DATED this 24th day of September, 2009. DATED this 24th day | | | | |
| Neil V. Wake United States District Judge | 5 | Time to Answer Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Doc. # 609) is denied as moot. | | |
| Neil V. Wake United States District Judge United States District Judge United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 6 | DATED this 24 th day of September, 2009. | | |
| Neil V. Wake United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 7 | | | |
| Neil V. Wake United States District Judge 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 8 | 1/2'01/11/1 | | |
| United States District Judge | 9 | | | |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 10 | | | |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 11 | | | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 12 | | | |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 13 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 14 | | | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 15 | | | |
| 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 16 | | | |
| 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 17 | | | |
| 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 18 | | | |
| 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 19 | | | |
| 22 23 24 25 26 27 | 20 | | | |
| 23 24 25 26 27 | 21 | | | |
| 24 25 26 27 | 22 | | | |
| 252627 | 23 | | | |
| 26 27 | 24 | | | |
| 27 | 25 | | | |
| | 26 | | | |
| 28 | 27 | | | |
| | 28 | | | |