

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

SHERRY ELLIS, *et al.*,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.) NO. CIV-16-0019-HE
)
DANIEL HOLTZCLAW, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

TABATHA BARNES, *et al.*,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
vs.) NO. CIV-16-0184-HE
)
CITY OF OKLAHOMA CITY, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

ADAIRA GARDNER,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) NO. CIV-16-0349-HE
)
DANIEL HOLTZCLAW, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

ROSETTA GRATE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-16-412-HE
)	
CITY OF OKLAHOMA CITY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

The plaintiffs in Case Nos. CIV-16-0184 and CIV-16-0349 have moved for, or agreed to, extension of the scheduling deadlines in those cases. The defendants other than defendant Brian Bennett do not object to the motion. Since the filing of the motion, the court has entered summary judgment in defendant Bennett's favor in Case No. CIV-16-0184, so he will not be affected by the timing of further proceedings. Defendant Holtzclaw has not objected to the request. Plaintiffs' unopposed motion [Doc. #186 in Case No. CIV-16-0184] is therefore **GRANTED**, as set forth by separate revised scheduling orders in those cases.

The parties in Case Nos. CIV-16-0019 and CIV-16-412 are directed to advise the court, by an appropriate filing within **seven (7) days**, whether they object to parallel extensions of the deadlines in those cases.

The parties in all four cases are directed to confer and advise the court, by one or more appropriate filings within **fourteen (14) days**, whether, in light of the discovery and other developments which have occurred since their filing, they object to the consolidation of these cases for all further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 7th day of May, 2019.



JOE HEATON
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE