

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

*

Plaintiffs,

*

v.

*

CIVIL NO. JKB-24-3267

**UNITEDHEALTH GROUP
INCORPORATED, et al.,**

*

*

Defendants.

*

* * * * *

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Defendants UnitedHealth Group Incorporated and Amedisys, Inc. filed a Motion to Dismiss on January 8, 2025. (ECF No. 75.) Defendants have also filed a Motion for Expedited Briefing Schedule on Motion to Dismiss. (ECF No. 79.) In it, they ask that the Plaintiffs' opposition to the Motion to Dismiss be due on January 21, 2025 and that Defendants' reply be within five business days of Plaintiffs' filing. (*Id.*) Plaintiffs oppose the Motion for Expedited Briefing, and seek a seven-day extension, to January 29, 2025, to file their opposition to the Motion to Dismiss. (ECF No. 83.) Defendants filed a reply in support of their Motion for Expedited Briefing. (ECF No. 87.)

The Court will deny the Motion for Expedited Briefing, and will grant Plaintiffs' request for a seven-day extension. Defendants do not provide sufficient reason for Plaintiffs' time to respond to be condensed. The Court has considered Defendants' contention that an "accelerated schedule is particularly important given Defendants' deadline to close on their merger agreement, which, as has been publicly reported, is set for December 31, 2025" and that "[s]ince fact discovery is proceeding while the motion is pending, a prompt resolution will avoid costly delays, particularly in third-party and expert discovery." (ECF No. 79.) However, the Court concludes

that a modest extension of seven days for Plaintiffs to file their opposition is appropriate. As Defendants explain, their “Motion to Dismiss addresses a threshold pleading issue with important implications for the entire case” that “must be addressed at the outset of the case.” (ECF No. 79.) Given the importance and case-wide implications of the issues raised by the Motion to Dismiss, the Court finds compelling Plaintiffs’ representation that they would be prejudiced by an expedited briefing schedule, and that they require additional time to respond. (See ECF No. 83.)

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that:

1. The Defendants’ Motion for Expedited Briefing Schedule on Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 79) is DENIED;
2. The Plaintiffs SHALL FILE their opposition to the Motion to Dismiss on or before January 29, 2025; and
3. The Defendants SHALL FILE their reply within 14 days after service of the opposition.¹

DATED this 14 day of January, 2025.

BY THE COURT:



James K. Bredar
United States District Judge

¹ Defendants are of course free to file their reply whenever they choose after the filing of Plaintiffs’ opposition.