



United States District Court
District of Minnesota
Patrick J. Schiltz, Chief Judge
Kate Fogarty, Clerk of Court
612-664-5000

Warren E. Burger Federal
Building and U.S.
Courthouse
316 North Robert Street
Suite 100
St. Paul, MN 55101

Edward J. Devitt U.S.
Courthouse and Federal
Building
118 South Mill Street
Suite 212
Fergus Falls, MN 56537

Gerald W. Heaney
Federal Building and U.S.
Courthouse and
Customhouse
515 West First Street
Suite 417
Duluth, MN 55802

Diana E. Murphy United
States Courthouse
300 South Fourth Street
Suite 202
Minneapolis, MN 55415

February 11, 2026

**PUBLIC NOTICE REGARDING
PROPOSED LOCAL RULE AMENDMENTS AND
AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL RULE 5.6
EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 11, 2026**

PROPOSED LOCAL RULE AMENDMENTS

The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota is issuing proposed amendments to Local Rules 6.1, 7.1, 17.1, 47.2, and 83.12. The Court's Federal Practice Committee, chaired by Rebekah Bailey from 2022 through 2025, recommended that public comment be solicited on the proposed amendments. They are posted for public review and comment through March 11, 2026.

A summary of the proposed amendments is provided below. To view the proposed amendments in redline and final form, please visit the Court's website at www.mnd.uscourts.gov.

LR 6.1 – Continuance (proposed abrogation and replacement with Motions to Extend Time)

It is proposed that current LR 6.1 be abrogated because it includes an "extreme good cause" standard that is not defined, and also because the current rule's requirement that continuance motions be in writing is redundant of LRs 16.3(a) and LR 7.1(b). A new LR 6.1 is being proposed that will govern motions to extend time. New LR 6.1 creates a consistent and more streamlined process for requesting an extension to a deadline, and clarifies that LR 7.1 does not apply to such requests. New LR 6.1 does not apply to motions to modify a scheduling order, which are governed by LR 16.3.

LR 7.1 – Civil Motion Practice

Proposed new provision 7.1(b)(4)(B)(iii) was created in conjunction with proposed new LR 6.1. The new provision in LR 7.1 clarifies that requests for extensions of time are not governed by LR 7.1 but instead by the more streamlined procedures in new LR 6.1.

LR 17.1 – Settlement of Action or Claim Brought by Guardian or Trustee

The proposed amendments clarify that LR 17.1 is not limited to diversity actions and wrongful-death actions. The Minnesota procedure referenced in LR 17.1 is found in the Minnesota Rules of General Practice.



LR 47.2 – Contacts with Jurors

The proposed amendments clarify the Court's authority to prohibit party contacts with jurors after jurors have been discharged from service. If a judge grants permission to contact jurors after discharge, parties' attorneys must follow Minnesota Rule of Professional Conduct 3.5.

LR 83.12 – Complaints Against a Judge

It is proposed that LR 83.12 be abrogated because it merely references statutory authority and existing rules governing the filing of a complaint against a judge. This information is available through the Court's public website.

Public Comment Instructions

Comments should be provided in writing to the Clerk of Court at the address above, or by e-mail to MnFedRules@mnd.uscourts.gov. The Court will consider adoption of the proposed amendments after reviewing any comments or suggestions submitted on or before March 11, 2026. Please note that all public comments received by the Court will be made available to the public.

AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL RULE 5.6 EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 11, 2026

The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota has approved amendments to Local Rule 5.6. After issuing for public comment proposed amendments to the rule and reviewing the recommendations of the Federal Practice Committee, the Court approved the amendments to take effect on February 11, 2026. A summary of the amendments is provided below. To view this and the amended Local Rules, please visit the Court's website at www.mnd.uscourts.gov.

LR 5.6 – Filing Documents Under Seal in Civil Cases

The main purpose of these amendments is to delay the deadline for filing the Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing until after the court has made a final decision on the main motion. This allows Magistrate Judges to consider that final decision when deciding whether documents should stay sealed. In the Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing, the parties should explain why specific documents should or should not remain sealed including whether the information was important to the court's decision.

This rule only applies to the parties' responsibilities for sealed filings. It does not limit the rights of nonparties to request access to sealed documents at any time by filing a proper motion, even if deadlines for the parties have passed.

After public comment, additional edits were made to LR 5.6(d)(4) to add clarity. The redline version following public comment is also available on the Court's website.