UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CADENCE BANK, et. al.,

Defendants.

Case No: 1:23-cv-01097-PLM-RSK

Hon. Paul L. Maloney

STIPULATION TO EXTEND DEFENDANT CADENCE BANK'S TIME TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT (ECF 66) PURSUANT TO RULE 6(b)(1)

Pro se Plaintiff Jeffrey Ryan Fenton and Defendant Cadence Bank ("Cadence Bank") hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint (ECF 66) on August 21, 2024.

2. Cadence Bank received the Amended Complaint on or about September 9, 2024.

3. Pursuant to Rule 12(a)(1)(A)(i), Cadence Bank has 21 days to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, which is extended by another 3 days pursuant to Rule 6(d) because Plaintiff completed service via mail.

4. Thus, the time for Cadence Bank to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint has not yet expired.

5. After Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint, the Court issued a Notice of Intent to transfer this matter to the United States District Court for the Middle

District of Tennessee and ordered the Parties to file any briefs, if desired, regarding the change of venue no later than October 4, 2024. (ECF 72).

6. Cadence Bank is a Mississippi corporation that retained local counsel in Michigan to represent it in this matter, and Cadence Bank will have to engage alternative counsel if this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee or another District Court outside the State of Michigan.

7. During a Local Rule 7.1 meet-and-confer on September 23, 2024, Cadence Bank requested and Plaintiff agreed to extend the time for Cadence Bank to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint until 21 days from the earlier of:

a. the date the Court enters an order transferring this case; or

b. the date the Court adjudicates the objections to the Notice of Intent to Transfer (ECF 72).

8. Rule 6(b)(1) provides that a court may, for good cause shown, extend the time for an act to be done if a party makes such request before the original time expires.

9. Good cause exists to grant an extension to prevent Cadence Bank from hiring and paying for multiple attorneys in different jurisdictions to defend against Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, which totals 103 pages exclusive of exhibits.

10. Good cause also exists for the purpose of judicial efficiency and to conserve judicial resources by adjourning Cadence Bank's response deadline until after this matter is transferred.

Jeffrey Ryan Fenton
Jeffrey Ryan Fenton (Sep 24, 2024 11:39 EDT)

Jeffrey R. Fenton
Pro se Plaintiff
17195 Silver Parkway #150
Fenton, MI 48430
(615) 837-1300
contact@jefffenton.com

Michael L. Gutierrez (P79440)
BUTZEL LONG, P.C.
Attorneys for Defendant Cadence Bank
300 Ottawa Avenue, NW, Suite 620
Grand Rapids, MI 49503
(616) 988-5600
gutierrez@butzel.com