

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Ronald J. Harris,
Plaintiff,
vs.
Joseph Arpaio, et al.,
Defendants.

No. CV 04-2770-PHX-DGC (ECV)

ORDER

Defendants have filed a Request for a Rule 16 Scheduling Conference (Doc. #44). Their request comes more than a year after this court issued a Rule 16 Scheduling and Discovery Order (Doc. #23) and approximately three months after the court granted their request for a four month extension of the dispositive motions deadline (Doc. #36). Defendants now claim that “[a]fter taking the time to adequately review the file,” they realize they need to conduct discovery to prepare a dispositive motion or for trial.

This case is already old. Now Defendants want the court to essentially scrap the scheduling order issued last year and start over. Their reasons for the request are not persuasive and the motion will therefore be denied. The dispositive motion deadline, already extended by four months to August 27, 2007, will not be extended further.¹

¹ Counsel for Defendants are cautioned that a Notice of Substitution like the one filed on April 17, 2007, is not an appropriate method to substitute in as counsel under the circumstances of this case. The rule cited in the notice, LRCiv 83.3(b)(4), does not apply

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

2 That Defendants' Request for a Rule 16 Scheduling Conference (Doc. #44) is **denied**.

3 DATED this 9th day of August, 2007.

4
5
6 

7 Edward C. Voss
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 _____
27 here. A proper motion in accordance with LRCiv 83.3(b)(1) or (2) should have been filed.
28 Although the court will not vacate the substitution at this point, counsel are expected to
comply with the rule going forward.