



abused its discretion in denying his motion for a continuance of his trial and a related motion to withdraw a brief filed by counsel.

We review a grant of summary judgment de novo. *Sullivan v. Or. Ford, Inc.*, 559 F.3d 594 (6th Cir. 2009) (citing *Miller v. Admin. Office of the Courts*, 448 F.3d 887, 893 (6th Cir. 2006)). The moving party is entitled to summary judgment “if the pleadings, the discovery and disclosure materials on file, and any affidavits show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(2); *see also Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247 (1986). We view factual evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party and draw all reasonable inferences in that party’s favor. *See Henderson v. Walled Lake Consol. Sch.*, 469 F.3d 479, 487 (6th Cir. 2006). We review a district court’s decision to deny a motion for a continuance for an abuse of discretion. *United States v. King*, 127 F.3d 483, 486 (6th Cir. 1997); *United States v. Gallo*, 763 F.2d 1504, 1523 (6th Cir. 1985).

We have carefully considered the parties’ briefs, the applicable law, and the district court’s order granting summary judgment to the Government and denying Gillingham’s request for a continuance and to withdraw counsel’s brief. We agree with the district court’s conclusion that no genuine issues of material fact exist and that the Government is entitled to judgment as a matter of law on its forfeiture claim. Further, we agree that, as to his two motions, Gillingham offers no support for his argument that the court’s orders constituted an “unreasoning and arbitrary insistence upon expeditiousness in the face of a justifiable request for delay,” *King*, 127 F.3d at 486-87, in violation of any due process rights. Because the district court’s decision is thorough and well-reasoned, *see United States v. 7046 Park Vista*, 537 F. Supp. 2d 929 (S.D.

Ohio 2008), we find no reason to expand on its analysis. Therefore, for the reasons stated in the district court's opinion, we **AFFIRM**.