



In support of the motion, the Household Defendants cite as follows:

1. Plaintiffs served their Second Set of Requests for Admissions numbered 3 through 57 on March 6, 2006 (the “Second Requests for Admission”). Plaintiffs also served their Third Set of Interrogatories numbered 19 through 56 on March 6, 2006 (the “Third Interrogatories”).

2. Although the Third Interrogatories are styled as 37 interrogatories, there are many discrete subparts making the interrogatories even more voluminous. Including all discrete subparts, the Household Defendants calculate that this third set contains at least 60 interrogatories.

3. The Household Defendants have been working on responding to the Second Requests for Admission and the Third Interrogatories since they were received. However, due to the volume and the complex nature of the requests, the Household Defendants are not able to complete their responses within the 30 days provided by the Federal Rules. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(3), 36(a). Defendants note that the 30 day limit provided in Rule 33(a) contemplates a party serving at most 25 interrogatories (including all discrete subparts) — a smaller number than Plaintiffs’ Third Interrogatories contain. Furthermore, the Federal Rules expressly contemplate a longer time to respond to interrogatories either as ordered by the court or agreed to by the parties. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(3).

4. Thus, as a matter of professional courtesy, on Monday, April 3, the Household Defendants requested a brief extension of the deadline from Plaintiffs: one additional week for the Second Requests for Admission and two weeks for the Third Interrogatories. Plaintiffs refused this request. (*See Exhibit A*).

5. Plaintiffs can show no prejudice from this brief extension to respond to their discovery requests. Although Plaintiffs cite to the current May 12, 2006 discovery cut off as a reason for denying the Household Defendants' request, this is mere gamesmanship of the most obvious kind. Reasonable people understand that the May 12 discovery deadline will be extended, and the Court so stated at the March 9 conference. *See* March 9, 2006 Transcript of Proceedings — Motion Before the Honorable Nan R. Nolan at 78 (“I am going to extend the discovery cutoff, but I am not going to do it today . . . .”)

***Wherefore***, the Household Defendants respectfully request that the Court grant one additional week to respond to Plaintiffs' Second Requests for Admission (until April 12) and two additional weeks to respond to Plaintiffs' Third Interrogatories (until April 19).

Dated: April 4, 2006  
Chicago, Illinois

Submitted by:

Defendants Household International, Inc.  
Household Finance Corporation, William F.  
Aldinger, David A. Schoenholz, Gary  
Gilmer  
and J.A. Vozar

By: s/ Adam B. Deutsch

One of their Attorneys

Nathan P. Eimer

Adam B. Deutsch

EIMER STAHL KLEVORN &  
SOLBERG LLP

224 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100  
Chicago, IL 60605

Tel: (312) 660-7600

Fax: (312) 692-1718

-and-

CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP

Eighty Pine Street

New York, NY 10005-1702

Tel: (212) 701-3000

Fax: (212) 269-5420

**Certificate of Service**

Adam B. Deutsch, an attorney, certifies that on April 4, 2006, he served copies of the Household Defendants' Motion for Extension of Time in Responding to Plaintiffs' Discovery Requests on the parties listed below in the manner stated.

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/ Adam B. Deutsch  
Adam B. Deutsch

**Via E-Mail and FedEx**

Patrick J. Coughlin  
Azra Z. Mehdi  
Luke O. Brooks  
LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP  
100 Pine Street, Suite 2600  
San Francisco, California 94111  
(415) 288-4545

**Via E-Mail and FedEx**

Marvin A. Miller  
Jennifer Winter Sprengel  
Lori A. Fanning  
MILLER FAUCHER and CAFFERTY LLP  
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 3200  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
(312) 782-4880

**Via E-Mail and FedEx**

Stanley J. Parzen  
Lucia Nale  
Susan Charles  
MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP  
190 South La Salle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 782-0600