## In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 13-465C (Filed: January 30, 2019)

## **ORDER**

On January 29, 2019, defendant filed an unopposed motion seeking an extension of time to April 29, 2019, to file its reply in support of its motion to dismiss. The court **GRANTS IN PART** and **DENIES IN PART** the motion. Defendant's reply is due by **no later than Monday**, **May 6, 2019.** The court is providing an additional seven days beyond the date proposed by defendant because, **by no later than March 1, 2019**, defendant shall file a separate document—modeled on the attached template—in which defendant identifies which claims are the subject of each argument in its motion to dismiss. Defendant shall also do the same for its reply and file that document at the same time as its reply. Additionally, in anticipation of defendant filing a motion to exceed the page limit, the court is permitting defendant to file an omnibus reply brief that contains no more than 100 pages.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Margaret M. Sweeney
MARGARET M. SWEENEY
Chief Judge

## **TEMPLATE**

## [Brief Title]

- II. The Court Lacks Jurisdiction To Entertain The Complaints Because FHFA Is Not The United States For Tucker Act Purposes When Acting As The Enterprises' Conservator¹
  - [Plaintiff's Name] Count [number(s)]<sup>2</sup>
  - [Plaintiff's Name] Count [number(s)]
- III. Under HERA's Succession Clause, Enterprise Shareholders Lack Standing to Bring Derivative Suits
  - [Plaintiff's Name] Count [number(s)]
  - [Plaintiff's Name] Count [number(s)]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The number and argument should match those in the corresponding brief.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The plaintiffs must be listed in alphabetical order.