

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, NORTHERN DIVISION

Jaylon Ke’Andre Gibson v. Community Choice Financial of
Mississippi, LLC

Gibson · No. 3:25-CV-949-DPJ-ASH · Decided January 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi denied Plaintiff Jaylon Ke’Andre Gibson’s motion to reconsider an order granting Defendant Community Choice Financial of Mississippi, LLC, an extension of time to respond to the complaint. The court held that, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A), the defendant showed good cause, acted without bad faith, and did not prejudice the plaintiff.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Northern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew S. Harris
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Northern Division
DECIDED	January 21, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-CV-949-DPJ-ASH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of the court's prior text-only order granting Defendant an extension of time to answer the Complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A), under which the court has discretion to extend a deadline for good cause before the original deadline expires, and considered the absence of bad faith or prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive value only

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should reconsider its prior order granting Defendant a fourteen-business-day extension to respond to the Complaint.
2. Whether the court could grant the extension under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) even if Plaintiff opposed the motion.

HOLDINGS

1. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A), the court may extend a deadline for good cause before the deadline expires, regardless of whether the extension motion is opposed.
2. Reconsideration was not warranted because, even assuming the extension motion was opposed, the court had authority to grant it and the Rule 6(b)(1)(A) factors supported the extension.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“ “[A]n application for extension of time under Rule 6(b)(1)(A) normally will be granted in the absence of bad faith on the part of the party seeking relief or prejudice to the adverse party.” ”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant sought a fourteen-business-day extension of its deadline to answer Plaintiff's Complaint. In an email exchange, Plaintiff opposed a thirty-day extension but stated that a fourteen-business-day extension might be reasonable. Defendant characterized the request as unopposed, and the court granted it as unopposed before Plaintiff's opposition was docketed. Plaintiff sought reconsideration, but the court found good cause, no bad faith, and no prejudice from the short extension.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendant moved for an extension of time to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint, representing that Plaintiff did not oppose a fourteen-business-day extension. The court granted the motion as unopposed on December 29, 2025. Plaintiff then moved for reconsideration, arguing that he had opposed the requested extension and that the court ruled before his opposition was docketed. After briefing, the court denied reconsideration.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Hetzel v. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 50 F.3d 360, 367 (5th Cir. 1995)
- Palmer v. Kirkwood, No. 4:20-CV-688-SDJ-KPJ, 2020 WL 13905123, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 23, 2020)

- Reed Migraine Ctrs. of Tex., PLLC v. Chapman, No. 3:14-CV-1204-N, 2020 WL 869888, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 21, 2020)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-mi/2026/jaylon-keandre-gibson-v-community-choice-financial-of-4ir8odwp>