IN THE CHANCERY COURT, STATE OF WYOMING

2026 WYCH 3

AutoVend Labs Inc., Plaintiff, v. Maunish Shah, Defendant.	Case No. CH-2025-0000031

Order Denying Defendant's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Complaint

---

[¶1] Mr. Shah seeks a 45-day extension to respond to the complaint in this expedited Chancery Court proceeding. *Mot. Ext. Time*, FSX No. 78265630. AutoVend Labs expressed concern about the length of the requested extension but did not oppose a brief extension. *Rsp. Mot. Ext. Time*, FSX No. 78343266. Under Wyoming law, answer deadlines may not be extended by party acquiescence or even by agreement; an extension requires a court order under the governing legal standard. Here, the governing legal standard is a showing of excusable neglect under W.R.C.P.Ch.C. 6(b)(1)(B). Mr. Shah has not shown excusable neglect as that standard has been applied by Wyoming precedent.

[¶2] Mr. Shah was served in California on December 19, 2025. *Aff. Service*, FSX No. 78091826. As a result, his answer was due on January 19, 2026. W.R.C.P.Ch.C. 12(a)(1)(A)(ii). Mr. Shah moved for an extension on January 22, 2026. Because Mr. Shah sought relief after his response deadline had expired, Rule 6(b)(1)(B) governs this request.

[¶3] Rule 6(b)(1)(B) permits an extension only upon a showing of "good cause" and "excusable neglect." *Weber v. McCoy*, 950 P.2d 548, 553 (Wyo. 1997) ("Because the patient waited until the prescribed response period had expired to make his motion, he was required to show 'excusable neglect.'"); *Harris v. Grizzle*, 625 P.2d 747, 750 (Wyo. 1981). Wyoming courts construe this standard strictly, reserving relief for "genuine emergency conditions[.]" *Crossan v. Irrigation Dev. Corp.*, 598 P.2d 812, 813 (Wyo. 1979) (excusable neglect is "measured on a strict standard to take care of genuine emergency conditions, such as death, sickness, undue delay in the mails, and

other situations where such behavior might be the act of a reasonably prudent person under the circumstances.") (citations omitted); *Harris*, 625 P.2d at 750 (applying *Crossman* to Rule 6(b)(1)(B)). *See also Wenwen Yu v. Next Technology Holding, Inc.*, 2025 WYCH 16, ¶12 (Wyo. Ch. C. 2025).

[¶4] Mr. Shah asserts difficulty obtaining counsel as the basis for his delay. Wyoming precedent squarely rejects this justification. A party's failure to secure counsel in a timely manner does not constitute excusable neglect. *Whitney v. McDonough*, 892 P.2d 791, 794 (Wyo. 1995) ("trial court could not have found excusable neglect was present" when a party was "dilatory in obtaining legal counsel."). *See also Rush v. Golkowski*, 2021 WY 27, ¶¶ 28-29, 480 P.3d 1174, 1181 (Wyo. 2021) ("The failure to find and hire an attorney does not alone therefore constitute excusable neglect" in the context of seeking relief from an entry of default.).

[¶5] Although AutoVend Labs does not oppose a brief extension, answer deadlines may not be extended by agreement or acquiescence alone. U.R.Ch.C. 202. *See also Platt v. Creighton*, 2007 WY 18, ¶ 10, 150 P.3d 1194, 1199–200 (Wyo. 2007) (agreement between counsel to extend the time to reply to a summary judgment motion was not excusable neglect for failing to file a timely reply). A court order is required, and the movant must satisfy the governing legal standard of excusable neglect before the court may issue such an order. *Weber*, 950 P.2d at 553.

[¶6] Mr. Shah has not shown excusable neglect. His only excuse—difficulty in obtaining counsel—has been rejected by the Wyoming Supreme Court. Mr. Shah's lack of counsel is not a condition caused by a genuine emergency, and a reasonably prudent person looking to engage counsel to defend in this lawsuit would not have delayed in doing so after receiving service of process. Granting an extension under these circumstances would not only run counter to the established legal standards that govern this court but would also undermine the expedited nature of Chancery Court proceedings.

[¶7] For these reasons, Mr. Shah's request for an extension of time to respond to the complaint must be **DENIED**.

Dated: 1/30/2026

/s/ Benjamin M. Burningham
CHANCERY COURT JUDGE