UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

BRIDGEPORT MUSIC, INC., et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	NO. 3:01-0697
	)	Jury Demand
COMIN' OUT OF THE CAGE MUSIC,	)	Judge Campbell/Brown
et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

O R D E R

The Court has received the Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration in Case No. 3:01-0412, as well as notices in a number of other cases that this pleading has been filed in the 3:01-0412 case.

Unfortunately, the plaintiff did not file a motion for an extension of time in Case No. 3:01-0412, and has filed a notice of pleading of the motion for reconsideration in a number of other cases in which it did not file the original motion (see for example 3:01-0698, 3:01-0707, 3:01-0708, and others).

Accordingly, the Clerk will be unable to file these motions in the appropriate case.

In reviewing the files, it appears that the lowest numbered case in which a motion for an extension of time to serve process was filed in the case of Bridgeport Music, Inc., et al. v.

This document was entered on
the docket in compliance with
Rule 58 and / or Rule 79 (a).
FRCP on 9-27-01 By

6

Comin' Out of the Cage Music, et al., Case No. 3:01-0697. Accordingly, the Clerk is **directed** to file the Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration in that case. The plaintiffs have filed a Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration in other cases. These notices of filing shall be docketed in the cases in which the original motion was filed with reference to the appropriate docket number in the case of 3:01-0697, rather than 3:01-0412.

If a notice of filing of plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration is filed in a case number in which an original motion was not filed, the Clerk shall return that notice to the plaintiff without docketing it.[1]

Upon consideration of the plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration, the motion is **GRANTED in part.** Provided the plaintiffs use personal service so that the time for response will be twenty (20) days after service, the plaintiffs may have until **October 29, 2001**, to complete service of process.[2]

---

[1]Although not specifically required by the Rules, the parties in this litigation are requested to include their telephone number in their signature block.

[2]The plaintiffs' motion requested an additional 15 day extension but then proposed October 31, 2001, which would be 16 days. The Magistrate Judge believes that a two-week extension is adequate.

The Clerk is **directed** to post this Order on the Court's webpage, www.tnmd.uscourts.gov, under Bridgeport General Orders, with the caption "Order Extending Time for Service of Process".

It is so **ORDERED**.

JOE B. BROWN
United States Magistrate Judge