

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

DR. MARK GEIER and DAVID GEIER)	
)	Case No. 1:05CV01749
Plaintiffs,)	Judge Thomas F. Hogan
)	
v.)	
)	
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN)	
SERVICES, et. al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**DEFENDANTS PARKER AND TODD'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR EMERGENCY STAY OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**

Defendants Parker and Todd respectfully respond to Plaintiffs' Motion for
Emergency Stay of Further Proceedings and state as follows:

1. Plaintiffs bring this claim for defamation against multiple defendants on the basis of a scientific article co-authored by Defendant's Parker and Todd.
2. On November 1, 2005, Defendants Parker and Todd filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction. Dr. Parker and Dr. Todd are physicians who live and practice medicine in Denver, Colorado. Neither resides in the District of Columbia, practices medicine in the District of Columbia, or conducts any business in the District of Columbia. Accordingly, Plaintiffs have not alleged any facts showing that Defendants Parker and Todd have the minimum contacts with the District of Columbia needed to confer personal jurisdiction over them in the District of Columbia.

3. On November 28, 2005, Defendants consented to allowing Plaintiffs an extension of time within which to respond to their Motion to Dismiss. On November 30, defendants again consented to addition time for filing a response with the stipulation that defendants would be granted additional time to file their Reply.

4. On December 12, 2005, Plaintiffs filed their Opposition to Defendants, Parker's and Todd's Motion to Dismiss and on January 17, 2006, Parker and Todd filed their Reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition.

5. As of January 17, 2006, this matter has been fully briefed and awaiting a decision by this Court. Now, nearly two months later, Plaintiffs have asked the Court to stay the briefing schedule on any motions before the Court so that they can obtain new attorneys.

6. While the Plaintiffs' requested stay of proceedings may be operative against any defendant whose motion to dismiss has not been fully briefed, Dr. Parker's and Dr. Todd's Motion to Dismiss has been fully briefed and there is no reason to delay a ruling. Accordingly, Dr. Parker and Dr. Todd oppose Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay only to the extent that it can be read to delay the Court's ruling on their fully briefed Motion to Dismiss.

7. Defendants Parker and Todd therefore respectfully request that this Court deny Plaintiffs' Motion as to Defendants Parker and Todd so that a decision can be made on their fully-briefed Motion to Dismiss without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

**ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &
MELLOTT, LLC**

Erica H. Perkins

Edward J. Longosz, II #368932

Erica Perkins #484162

1747 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.,

Suite 1200

Washington, D.C. 20006

Patrick T. O'Rourke

Patrick T. O'Rourke

Managing Associate University Counsel

University of Colorado

1380 Lawrence Street, Suite 1325

Denver, CO 80204

303-556-4339

FACSIMILE: 303-825-7630

Patrick.Orourke@cudenver.edu

Attorneys for Defendants Parker and Todd

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing **Response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Emergency Stay of Further Proceedings** was served electronically, this 27th day of March 2006.

James A. Moody, Esquire
The Cullen Law Firm, P.L.L.C.
1101 30th Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007

Joseph A. Hennessey, Esquire
7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 700
Bethesda, MD 20814

Alan Burch, Esquire
U.S. Attorney's Office
555 Fourth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Jay Ward Brown, Esquire
Adam J. Rappaport, Esquire
Levine Sullivan Koch & Schultz, LLP
1050 17th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

Erica H. Perkins
Erica H. Perkins