

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

3M COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOULTER, et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 11-cv-1527 (RLW)

ORDER

Upon consideration of the District of Columbia's unopposed Motion to Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Defending the Validity of a Statute Enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia (Docket No. 22), and the entire record, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Motion is **GRANTED**; and it is further,

ORDERED that the District of Columbia shall be permitted to intervene in this matter only for the limited purpose of defending the District of Columbia Anti-SLAPP Act of 2010 (D.C. Code §§ 16-5502-5505); and it is further,

ORDERED that, upon consideration of all briefs on the Motion to Stay Proceedings by Defendants Lanny Davis, Davis-Block LLC, and Lanny J. Davis & Associates PLLC (Docket No. 13), and the entire record, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Motion to Stay is **DENIED**; and it is further,

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery (Docket No. 16) is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**; Plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED** to file a substantive response to the Special Motion to Dismiss by Defendants Lanny Davis, et al. (Docket No. 8) in accordance with the briefing schedule set forth below. If, in opposing the Special Motion, Plaintiff contends that the Court should not grant

the Special Motion without allowing Plaintiff the opportunity to take discovery, Plaintiff must set forth with particularity and specificity precisely what targeted topics and/or categories of discovery it needs to defeat the Special Motion, as well as what that discovery will likely show. If Plaintiff contends that it will be prejudiced by the inability to take discovery, it must set forth with particularity why it would suffer such prejudice; and it is further,

ORDERED that this case shall proceed in accordance with the following deadlines and procedures:

Defendants' Answers or Rule 12 Motions to Dismiss due:	November 18, 2011
Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (Dkt. No. 16) due:	November 29, 2011
District of Columbia's Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (Dkt. No. 16) due:	November 29, 2011
Plaintiff's Opposition to Davis Defendants' Special Motion to Dismiss (Docket No. 8) due:	December 15, 2011
Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Motion to Strike (Dkt. No. 16) due:	December 15, 2011
Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Rule 12 Motions to Dismiss, if any, due:	December 15, 2011
Defendants' Replies in Support of Rule 12 Motions to Dismiss, if any, due:	December 31, 2011
Davis Defendants' Reply, if any, in Support of Special Motion to Dismiss due:	December 31, 2011

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all parties, including intervenor, shall appear for a hearing on all outstanding motions on **January 12, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. in Courtroom 17.**

SO ORDERED.
Date: November 15, 2011



Digitally signed by Judge Robert L. Wilkins
DN: cn=Judge Robert L. Wilkins, o=U.S.
District Court, ou=Chambers of Honorable
Robert L. Wilkins,
email=RW@dc.uscourts.gov, c=US
Date: 2011.11.15 09:29:04 -05'00'

ROBERT L. WILKINS
United States District Judge