

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

UHLIG, LLC d/b/a CONDOCERTS™ and WELCOMELINK®,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	CIVIL ACTION
v.)	
)	No. 22-2475-KHV
PROPLOGIX, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Uhlig, LLC’s Motion For Continuance And Memorandum In Support (Doc. #261) filed February 21, 2024, which seeks a continuance of trial and pretrial deadlines. For reasons stated below, the Court overrules Uhlig’s motion.

Uhlig is a plaintiff in a separate action which has a scheduled trial date of July 2, 2024. See Uhlig v. CoreLogic, Inc. et al., No. 21-2543-DDC. The trial in CoreLogic is expected to take ten days. Trial of this matter is currently set for July 8, 2024 and is expected to take five days.

Uhlig argues that it “will not be able to proceed based on the overlapping trial dates” and pretrial deadlines. Motion For Continuance And Memorandum In Support (Doc. #261) at 2.¹ In this action, Uhlig is represented by four attorneys from a national law firm that has more than 550 attorneys.² In the CoreLogic action, Uhlig is represented by three of those same attorneys. Uhlig utterly fails to explain how its counsel cannot adequately prepare for two trials in July. The

¹ Uhlig notes that it advised the Court of its conflict in October of 2023 “shortly after this case was scheduled for trial on July 8.” Motion For Continuance And Memorandum In Support (Doc. #261) at 2. In fact, the Court first set the case for trial some six months before Uhlig filed its motion to continue based on the conflict with the CoreLogic trial setting. See Scheduling Order (Doc. #42) filed April 21, 2023 at 2 (setting trial for July 8, 2024).

² Uhlig also is represented by a fifth attorney from a local law firm.

record suggests no reason why current counsel cannot meet the pretrial deadlines in both cases. To the extent that Uhlig and its counsel believe that additional resources are necessary to prepare for trial in either or both cases, the Court is confident that counsel can easily secure such resources. As to the potential conflicting trial dates, the undersigned judge will coordinate with Judge Crabtree to ensure that if CoreLogic goes to trial on July 2, this matter can still commence in July, shortly after the conclusion of the CoreLogic trial and perhaps the next business day. The Court therefore overrules plaintiff's motion to continue trial and pretrial deadlines.³

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Uhlig LLC's Motion For Continuance And Memorandum In Support (Doc. #261) filed February 21, 2024 is **OVERRULED**.

Dated this 8th day of March, 2024 at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Kathryn H. Vratil
KATHRYN H. VRATIL
United States District Judge

³ Uhlig's present opinion that trial in CoreLogic is likely or a "likely certainty" does not inform the Court of the true likelihood that the parties in either CoreLogic or this matter will proceed to trial. Motion For Continuance And Memorandum In Support (Doc. #261) at 1. Indeed, despite similar representations from counsel to this Court over many years, more than 95 per cent of cases with a trial date some four months away do in fact settle before trial. Perhaps the parties and counsel would do well to focus less on raising technical objections to discovery and more on developing plans to reach a practical resolution of their competing claims by trial, settlement or summary judgment. See, e.g., Order (Doc. #285) filed March 1, 2024 at 2 (Mr. Uhlig refused to appear at deposition in individual capacity or as Rule 30(b)(6) representative because counsel noticed deposition for Kansas City, MO instead of two miles away in Kansas or by video); MapQuest, <https://www.mapquest.com/directions> (Uhlig's lead counsel's office at 2300 Main Street in Kansas City, MO, one mile away from where deposition noticed at defense counsel's office at 1201 Walnut Street).