

1 Georgia A. Staton, Bar #004863
2 Ravi V. Patel, Bar #030184
3 Eileen Dennis GilBride, Bar #009220
4 JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI P.L.C.
5 40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2700
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
7 Telephone: (602) 263-1752
8 gstaton@jshfirm.com
9 rpatel@jshfirm.com

10 Attorneys for Defendants

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

13 Michelle Pettitt,
14 Plaintiff,
15 v.
16 Glen Marvin Lineberry, an individual, et
17 al.,
18 Defendants/Counterclaimants.

No. CV-26-00634-PHX-JJT

**Defendants’ Motion to Exceed the
Page Limit for their Motion to Dismiss
Reply**

19 Defendants Lineberry, Dorathy, and Miami Unified School District #40
20 (“Defendants”) respectfully request the Court to grant them leave to file an oversized Reply
21 in Support of their Motion to Dismiss. The presumptive page limit for a Reply is 11 pages.
22 See LRCiv 7.2. Defendants’ Reply is 14 pages (with the Conclusion at the top of page 15).
23 A copy of Defendants’ proposed reply is lodged herewith for the Court’s review.

24 First, as the Court can see from the lodged reply, Defendants’ arguments are very
25 concise, do not repeat the motion arguments, and directly address each of Plaintiff’s points
26 on each claim. But Plaintiff’s response included many incorrect arguments and many
27 inapposite cases for each of the seven claims at issue. Defendants’ reply needed to address
28 each one and to explain why Plaintiff’s arguments and cases are inapposite. Indeed,
Defendants worked hard to present their arguments in the original motion within the page
limit, and Plaintiff in response accused Defendants’ arguments of being “superficial” and
“underdeveloped.” [Doc. 29, p. 2.] They weren’t superficial *or* underdeveloped, but to be

1 very clear, Defendants in their Reply have answered Plaintiff's call to ensure that their
2 reply arguments, while being concise and pointed, are fully developed.

3 Second, Defendants believe their motion papers will greatly reduce the number of
4 issues involved here (if not eliminate them all entirely), and thus allowing the few extra
5 pages now will reap great rewards for the course of this case.

6 Third, rather than pack the reply with page-long paragraphs to try to squeeze all
7 their arguments into 11 pages, Defendants used extra space to include numerous headings
8 and subheadings so as to make their arguments more understandable and readable for the
9 Court.

10 Defendants' counsel asked Plaintiff's counsel for a stipulation, but Plaintiff's
11 counsel declined.

12 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request the Court to allow them
13 to file their 14 ¼ page reply to their motion to dismiss. A proposed order is attached hereto.

14 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 8th day of June, 2026.

15 JONES, SKELTON & HOCHULI, P.L.C.

16
17 By /s/ Eileen Dennis GilBride

18 Georgia A. Staton
19 Ravi V. Patel
20 Eileen Dennis GilBride
21 40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2700
22 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
23 Attorneys for Defendants
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 8th day of June, 2026, I caused the foregoing document to be filed electronically with the Clerk of Court through the CM/ECF System for filing; and served on counsel of record via the Court’s CM/ECF system.

/s/Karen Gawel

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Michelle Pettitt,

Plaintiff,

v.

Glen Marvin Lineberry, an individual, et
al.,

Defendants/Counterclaimants.

No. CV-26-00634-PHX-JJT

**[Proposed] Order Granting
Defendants' Motion For Page
Extension For Their Reply Motion to
Dismiss**

The Court has reviewed the Motion for Page Extension filed by Defendants Lineberry, Dorathy, and Miami Unified School District #40 (“Defendants”), and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Defendants’ Motion for Page Extension for their Reply Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**. The lodged Reply shall be filed.

Hon. John Tuchi

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Michelle Pettitt,

Plaintiff,

v.

Glen Marvin Lineberry, an individual, et
al.,

Defendants/Counterclaimants.

No. CV-26-00634-PHX-JJT

**[Proposed] Order Granting
Defendants' Motion For Page
Extension For Their Reply Motion to
Dismiss**

The Court has reviewed the Motion for Page Extension filed by Defendants Lineberry, Dorathy, and Miami Unified School District #40 (“Defendants”), and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Defendants’ Motion for Page Extension for their Reply Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**. The lodged Reply shall be filed.

Hon. John Tuchi