

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

MICHAEL J. FORBES,

*Plaintiff*

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

*Defendant.*

No. 24-1953  
(Filed: November 25, 2025)

## ORDER

On November 21, 2025, the Government filed a Motion to Amend Schedule (ECF 39), requesting the adoption of its proposed schedule for further proceedings. ECF 39 at 1-2. Plaintiff opposes the Motion. ECF 40. In his response, Plaintiff maintains that “it is clear that the Defendant has not done their due diligence with the time allotted to them by this Court” and avers that “[t]he only circumstance that the Plaintiff would agree to any extension of time would be if the Defendant is requesting arbitration towards a settlement agreement.” ECF 40 at 1. Plaintiff did not propose an alternative schedule. *See id.*

Though the Court sympathizes with Plaintiff’s frustration regarding the speed of the litigation, it nonetheless recognizes the challenges borne by the Department of Justice following the recent lapse in appropriations, including difficulties coordinating with agency personnel. Further, the Court deems the Government’s proposed schedule reasonable and likely to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of this matter. Accordingly, the Government’s Motion is **GRANTED**, and the parties are **DIRECTED** to adhere to the following schedule:

Government provides proposed AR to Plaintiff	December 5, 2025
Government files AR and Regulatory Appendix	December 12, 2025
Plaintiff’s MJAR	January 9, 2026
Government’s Cross-MJAR and Response to Plaintiff’s MJAR	January 30, 2026
Plaintiff’s Reply in support of his MJAR and Response to Government’s Cross-MJAR	February 13, 2026
Government’s Reply in support of its Cross-MJAR	February 27, 2026

The Court does not anticipate granting any further extensions of time absent extraordinary circumstances.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

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