

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division**

SEALED PLAINTIFF 1,

and

SEALED PLAINTIFF 2,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Civil Action No. 3:22-cv-00670

PATRIOT FRONT, *et al.*,

Defendants.


ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Nathan Noyce, Thomas Dail, Paul Gancarz, Daniel Turechi, and Aedan Tredinnick’s (collectively, “Defendants”) Agreed Motion for Extension of Time and Incorporated Memorandum (the “Motion”). (ECF No. 129.) Defendants move the Court for an extension of time to file their respective Answers to the Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 129, at 1.) Defendants request that the Court extend this deadline from April 15, 2024 to April 25, 2024. (ECF No. 129, at 1–2.) In support of this request, Defendants note that the Amended Complaint is “fairly lengthy . . . and there are multiple Defendants in different locations with different schedules.” (ECF No. 129, at 1.) Defendants aver that Plaintiffs consent to this request. (ECF No. 129, at 2.)

Upon due consideration, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)¹, and for good cause shown, the Court GRANTS the Motion. (ECF No. 129.) Defendants SHALL file their respective Answers to the Amended Complaint by April 25, 2024.

It is SO ORDERED.

Date: 4/12/24
Richmond, Virginia



/s/
M. Hannah Lauck
United States District Judge

¹ Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) states, in relevant part:

(1) *In General.* When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time:

(A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires[.]

Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B).