

ORAL ORDER: The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's Motion for an Extension of Time to Respond to Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings and subsequent briefing. D.I. 68; D.I. 69; D.I. 70. The parties previously stipulated to a 10-day extension of time, see D.I. 71, which this Court granted. For the foregoing reasons, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Uber's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings is DENIED. Rule 6(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure permits a court, "for good cause," to "extend the time" that a party has to complete "an act." In order to establish good cause pursuant to Rule 6(b)(1)(A), the moving party must demonstrate that it cannot reasonably meet the court's deadlines despite its diligence. See, e.g., Tonal Sys., Inc. v. iFIT, Inc., No. CV 20-1197-GBW, 2022 WL 13944658, at \*1 (D. Del. Oct. 24, 2022). Here, Plaintiff has failed to show good cause as to why it cannot meet the present deadline, and a five-week extension would prejudice Defendant. To the extent Defendant cites to Plaintiff's Opening Claim Construction briefing in their Reply to Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, D.I. 64, Plaintiff may seek file a motion for leave to file a sur-reply to address those arguments. See D. Del. Local Rule 7.1.2. ORDERED by Judge Gregory B. Williams on 4/17/23. (ntl) (Entered: 04/17/2023)

As of April 18, 2023, PACER did not contain a publicly available document associated with this docket entry. The text of the docket entry is shown above.

*SurgeTech, LLC v. Uber Technologies Inc. d/b/a Uber*  
1-22-cv-00882 (DDE), 4/17/2023, docket entry 73