

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

BRUCE WASHINGTON, ET AL.

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

No. 22-632

RANDY SMITH, ET AL.

SECTION I

ORDER & REASONS

Before the Court is plaintiffs' motion¹ to extend the deadlines for plaintiffs' expert reports and the close of discovery. Defendants oppose² the motion.

A court's scheduling order may be modified "only for good cause and with the judge's consent." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The Fifth Circuit applies a four-factor test in considering requests to modify a scheduling order, weighing (1) the explanation for the failure to adhere to the deadline at issue; (2) the importance of the proposed modification to the scheduling order; (3) potential prejudice; and (4) the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice. *Geiserman v. MacDonald*, 893 F.2d 787, 790–92 (5th Cir. 1990).

"A trial court has broad discretion to preserve the integrity and purpose of its pretrial orders 'which, toward the end of court efficiency, is to expedite pretrial procedure.'" *Boyd v. Boeing Co.*, No. 15-25, 2016 WL 760687, at *3 (E.D. La. Feb. 26,

¹ R. Doc. No. 48.

² R. Doc. No. 49.

2016) (Africk, J.) (quoting *S & W Enters., L.L.C. v. SouthTrust Bank of Ala., NA*, 315 F.3d 533, 535 (5th Cir. 2003)).

Having considered the parties' positions, the Court concludes that the plaintiffs have not established good cause for the proposed deadline extensions.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion³ is **DENIED**.

New Orleans, Louisiana, October 20, 2022.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lance Africk", written over a horizontal line.

LANCE M. AFRICK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³ R. Doc. No. 48.