

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

TABATHA BARNES, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. CIV-16-184-HE
	)	
THE CITY OF OKLAHOMA CITY	)	
a municipal corporation, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**DEFENDANT CITY’S OBJECTION TO DEFENDANT HOLTZCLAW’S  
MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINES AND AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT**

Defendant, the City of Oklahoma City (“City”), by and through counsel of record, Richard N. Mann, respectfully objects to the Motion to Extend Deadlines by Defendant Holtzclaw. In support hereof Defendant City states as follows:

1. The Motion for Extension by Holtzclaw accurately reflects the objection by the City Defendants;
2. Holtzclaw has recently filed a Motion to Compel, which was stricken by the Court for failure to comply with LCvR 37, and he wishes to extend discovery timeframe to pursue a Motion to Compel on Discovery from the City and Plaintiffs;
3. The City’s counsel has attempted to explain to Holtzclaw’s attorney that it has provided 37,000 documents and items in previous responses and there is no reason to keep discovery open;

4. The City has recently filed motions for permission to file enlarged motions for summary judgment in these cases, which was granted on September 7, 2021, and the deadline for the dispositive motions is September 15, 2021. If the Court grants the motion of Holtzclaw, the City Defendants will have to request an extension of the dispositive motion deadlines to avoid resulting prejudice of allowing all parties another opportunity to pick apart their summary judgment motions;

5. Discovery was over on September 1, 2021, following years of litigation and numerous extensions of all deadlines which should have enabled all parties ample time to conduct discovery whether represented by the same attorney or not.

6. The City has probably already provided much of the requested discovery to Holtzclaw as well as everyone else, it would however require his counsel to go back and review all 37,000 documents

7. At the hearing on August 4, 2021, on the Plaintiff's Motion to Compel a Rule 30b6 deposition of the City, the Court stressed to all parties to try and keep this matter on track for the currently scheduled December trial docket.

8. The court should deny the extension request because it will render the current scheduling timeframe a nullity.

Wherefore, the Court should deny the extension of the discovery deadlines.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kenneth Jordan  
MUNICIPAL COUNSELOR

/s/ Richard N. Mann  
Sherri R. Katz, OBA # 14551  
Richard N. Mann, OBA # 11040  
Thomas Lee Tucker, OBA # 20874  
Assistant Municipal Counselors  
200 N. Walker, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oklahoma City, OK 73102  
(405) 297-2451  
[sherri.katz@okc.gov](mailto:sherri.katz@okc.gov)  
[Richard.mann@okc.gov](mailto:Richard.mann@okc.gov)  
[thomasltucker@okc.gov](mailto:thomasltucker@okc.gov)  
Attorneys for Defendant City, City and  
Gregory

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2021, I electronically transmitted the above document to the Clerk of the Court using ECF filing system. Based on the records currently on file in this case, the Clerk of the Court will transmit Notice of Electronic filing to those registered participants of the Electronic Case Filing System.

/s/ Richard N. Mann  
Assistant Municipal Counselor