UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JACOB TEITELBAUM, individually and as father to CHILD A and CHILD B,
Plaintiff,

v.

JUDA KATZ; CHAYA KATZ; JOEL TENNENBAUM; BLUMA TENNENBAUM; DAVID RUBENSTEIN; KIRYAS JOEL COMM. AMBULANCE CRP; ATTY. MARIA PETRIZIO; CHILDREN'S RIGHTS SOCIETY OF ORANGE COUNTY; ATTY. KIM PAVLOVIC; ATTY. JOHN FRANCIS X. BURKE; CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES OF ORANGE COUNTY; CHRISTINE BRUNET; ATTY. STEPHANIE BAZILEOR; JOHN DOES 1 THROUGH 95; JANE DOES 1 THROUGH 20,
Defendants.

ORDER

12 CV 2858 (VB)

This Order resolves all the various applications made in plaintiff's two letters dated February 27, 2013, both of which will be docketed.

1. As to defendants Kiryas Joel EMS and Rubenstein, plaintiff is referred to page 13 of the Court's Memorandum Decision dated February 11, 2013 (Doc. #138), which states: "Plaintiff is granted leave to file a second amended complaint by no later than March 11, 2013, for the sole purpose of alleging sufficient facts to support a Section 1983 or 1985 claim against Kiryas Joel EMS and Rubenstein."

2. As to defendants Juda Katz, Chaya Katz, Joel Tennenbaum, and Bluma Tennenbaum, in its Order dated February 22, 2013 (Doc. #145), after finding that plaintiff had failed to state a claim under Sections 1983 and 1985, the Court granted leave to plaintiff to file a second amended complaint as to these four defendants specifically to allege facts demonstrating that the Katzes and Tennenbaums were state actors for purposes of Section 1983 and that they conspired to deprive plaintiff of his constitutional rights under Sections 1983 or 1985.

3. The deadline for plaintiff to file a second amended complaint solely with respect to defendants Kiryas Joel EMS, Rubenstein, Juda Katz, Chaya Katz, Joel Tennenbaum, and Bluma Tennenbaum, has already been extended to April 12, 2013. (Doc. #145). No extension of this deadline will be granted.

4. Plaintiff's request for "extra time to perfect the Motion to Reconsider" is denied, except as follows: As the Court previously ordered, plaintiff shall be permitted to supplement his Motion for Reconsideration by no later than March 12, 2013. (See Order dated Feb. 27, 2013; Doc. #153). No extension of this deadline will be granted.

5. As to defendant Burke, plaintiff shall file his response to Burke's motion to dismiss by April 8, 2013, setting forth any and all arguments he may have in opposition thereto, and Burke shall file his reply, if any, by April 22, 2013. No extension of these deadlines will be granted.

6. Plaintiff's request for leave to amend as to defendant Burke is denied. Plaintiff may renew his motion for leave to amend as to Burke at the time he submits his opposition to Burke's motion to dismiss.

7. Plaintiff's request "to include [defendant Burke] in the Motion for Reconsideration" is denied as premature. The Court has not yet ruled on Burke's motion to dismiss.

Dated: February 28, 2013
White Plains, NY

SO ORDERED:

Vincent L. Briccetti
United States District Judge