

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

MICHAEL J. FORBES,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

No. 24-1953

(Filed: March 25, 2025)

ORDER

On March 18, 2025, the Court set aside the Clerk's entry of default in this matter. ECF 17. Now the Court turns to the Government's Motion for Entry of Scheduling Order, filed on March 5, 2025, which proposes dates for dispositive motions and briefing as well as the submission of the administrative record. ECF 15. Plaintiff filed a response to the Motion on March 14, 2025. ECF 16. However, Plaintiff's Response does not propose an alternative schedule or dates but merely rehashes previous arguments regarding whether to set aside the default. Because the Court has already ruled on that issue, Plaintiff's arguments have no bearing on the instant matter of scheduling. For good cause shown, and in the absence of an alternative proposal, the Government's Motion is **GRANTED**, and the Court will adopt the Government's proposed schedule, pushing each date back by one week. Accordingly, the parties are **ORDERED** to adhere to the following schedule:

1.	Defendant shall provide Plaintiff a copy of the administrative record	April 2, 2025
2.	Defendant shall file the administrative record and regulatory appendix	April 9, 2025
3.	Defendant shall file motion for judgment on the administrative record	April 23, 2025
4.	Plaintiff shall file cross-motion for judgment upon the administrative record and response to Defendant's motion	May 7, 2025
5.	Defendant shall file reply in support of motion for judgment upon the	May 14, 2025

	administrative record and response to Plaintiff's cross-motion	
6.	Plaintiff shall file reply in support of cross-motion for judgment upon the administrative record	May 21, 2025

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Philip S. Hadji
PHILIP S. HADJI
Judge