

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

JANE DOE NO. 2,

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

JANE DOE NO. 3,

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80232-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

JANE DOE NO. 4,

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80380-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs. JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

JANE DOE NO. 5,

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80381-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

JANE DOE NO. 6,

CASE NO.: 08-80994-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

JANE DOE NO. 7,

CASE NO.: 08-80993-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

C.M.A.,

CASE NO.: 08-80811-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

JANE DOE,

CASE NO.: 08-80893-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN et al,

Defendants.

_____ /

DOE II,

CASE NO.: 09- 80469-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN et al,

Defendants.

_____ /

JANE DOE NO. 101,

CASE NO.: 09- 80591-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

_____ /

JANE DOE NO. 102

CASE NO.: 09-
80656-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

_____ /

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on Plaintiff's Agreed Motion for Extension of Time in Which to File a Reply to Epstein's Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion

for Protective Order Re: Treatment Records and Agreed Motion for Extension of Time to File a Response to Epstein's Motion to Strike C.M.A.'s Conditional Notice of Intent to Rely Exclusively on Statutory Damages (D.E. #234 in 08-80119). For the following reasons said Motion is granted in part and deferred in part as follows.

By this Motion Plaintiff seeks two distinct forms of relief each of which, due to the nature of the relief sought, require a ruling by two different judges, the District Judge (regarding response to Epstein's Motion to Strike C.M.A.'s Conditional Notice of Intent to Rely) and the Magistrate Judge (regarding reply in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order). The consolidation of several motions into one pleading is an accepted practice in this district. However, where the relief sought in the motions requires rulings by two different judges assigned to the case, in this instance a district judge and a magistrate judge, the practice is frowned upon as it results in a waste of judicial resources and creates general confusion in the court file. Accordingly, all parties are hereby put on notice that in the future the Court will strike any motion which groups together motions that require disposition by more than one judge. Having reviewed the pleadings filed incident to this Motion, and being otherwise duly advised in the premises, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Agreed Motion for Extension of Time in Which to File a Reply to Epstein's Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order Re: Treatment Records and Agreed Motion for Extension of Time to File a Response to Epstein's Motion to Strike C.M.A.'s Conditional Notice of Intent to Rely Exclusively on Statutory Damages (D.E. #234) is **GRANTED IN PART AND DEFERRED IN PART AS FOLLOWS:** Plaintiff's Motion, to the extent it seeks an extension of time until

August 7, 2009, to file a reply in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's Motion, to the extent it seeks an extension of time until August 7, 2009, to file a response to Epstein's Motion to Strike C.M.A.'s Conditional Notice of Intent to Rely is **DEFERRED TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**, as the undersigned is without authority to rule on same.

DONE AND ORDERED this August 4, 2009, in Chambers, at West Palm Beach, Florida.



LINNEA R. JOHNSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

CC: The Honorable Kenneth A. Marra
All Counsel of Record