

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

SEAN McCLENDON

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO, et al.,

Defendants,

Hon. Sharon Coleman

No. 1:22-cv-05472

**DEFENDANT CITY OF CHICAGO'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO
RESCHEDULE HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
QUASH AND TO EXTEND TIME FOR THE CITY TO RESPOND**

On July 12th, Plaintiff filed a motion to quash subpoenas for prison call recordings that the City of Chicago intends to serve on third parties. (See dkt. 39.) The Court scheduled a hearing on that motion for July 25th at 10:00 a.m. (See dkt. 40.) The City's counsel is traveling and unavailable for argument during the week of the 25th. After conferring with Plaintiff's counsel, who has no objection to this motion, the parties are available to argue Plaintiff's motion to quash on August 1st, 8th, or 9th (consistent with the Court's civil motion hearing schedule).¹ Rescheduling to any of these dates will not interfere with any dates set by Judge Coleman.

¹ In the last joint status report (see dkt. 37), the City explained that it was having difficulty obtaining unredacted phone call lists and call logs from the Illinois Department of Corrections. Communications are ongoing between the City and an IDOC attorney familiar with the matter regarding obtaining that information. Should the Court select either August 8th or 9th for hearing, it would allow additional time for the City to continue its efforts to obtain and review that information, which could aid the parties – or the Court, should Court intervention still be needed – in resolving the disputed scope of the City's subpoenas.

The City also asks that if the hearing is rescheduled, it be given additional time to respond to Plaintiff's motion: the City's response is currently due on July 19th. If the hearing is rescheduled to August 1st, the City asks that its response be due July 26th. If the hearing is rescheduled to August 8th or 9th, the City asks that its response be due August 2nd.

WHEREFORE, the City asks that the Court (1) reschedule oral argument on Plaintiff's motion to quash to August 2nd, 8th or 9th, and (2) accordingly, extend the City's response deadline to either July 26th or August 2nd.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary B. Richardson-Lowry
Acting Corporation Counsel of the City of Chicago,

/s/ Brian Wilson
Special Assistant Corporation Counsel
NATHAN & KAMIONSKI, LLP
33 W. Monroe, Suite 1830
Chicago, IL, 60603
312-957-6649
bwilson@nklawllp.com

Attorneys for Defendant City of Chicago