

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
JONESBORO DIVISION**

**CONNIE STEELE, as Mother and Next of
Kin of Phillip T. Cameron, Deceased**

PLAINTIFF

vs.

CASE NO. 3:07-CV-00197

**GRAHAM L. CROOK, HERTZ RENTAL
CAR LLC, HERTZ CORPORATION and
AMERICAN FAMILY MUTUAL INSURANCE, as
Uninsured Motorist Carrier**

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Before the Court is a Motion for Extension of Discovery and Motion Deadline filed by Plaintiff Connie Steele. Defendant Graham L. Crook objects strenuously to the motion. The Court directs the parties to confer and to respond to this Order by June 22, 2009.

This case is presently scheduled for trial on August 17, 2009. Plaintiff seeks an extension of the discovery of the June 5th discovery deadline and the June 19th motion deadline. Plaintiff states that discovery has not yet been completed, but fails to identify with particularity the discovery that remains to be completed. Additionally, Plaintiff has failed to propose new deadlines or to state whether the extensions, if permitted, will permit this case to be ready to go to trial on August 17th.

Defendant Crook argues that Plaintiff has failed to show good cause for extending the discovery and motion deadline. Defendant argues that while Plaintiff referred to a “life economist” in her discovery, no such expert has been identified. Defendant also states that Plaintiff has failed to provide any expert disclosures, thus suggesting that there should be no

experts for the Plaintiff.

The Court is not opposed to permitting additional time for discovery upon a showing of good cause. The present record does not establish good cause. At a minimum, Plaintiff must identify the discovery that remains and state why it hasn't already been completed. Additionally, the Court will require identification of all discovery to be completed and a plan for completing the discovery. Finally, if an extension is to be permitted, the Court requires additional input from the parties in order to establish new deadlines.

The Court directs the parties to confer for the purpose of determining whether they can agree upon these issues. If so, they shall identify the depositions to be taken, schedule them if possible or establish an appropriate date for their completion, and propose a date certain for the extended deadlines. Further, the parties shall state whether the case should remain on the Court's trial calendar for August 17, 2009. To maintain the currently scheduled trial date, the motion deadline must not be later than July 7, 2009.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Discovery and Motion Deadlines (Docket No. 50) be, and it is hereby, held in abeyance pending a response from Plaintiff and Separate Defendant Graham L. Crook to this Order, which shall be filed not later than **5:00 p.m. on Monday, June 22, 2009**. The Court prefers a joint response, if possible.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 12th day of June, 2009.

/s/Garnett Thomas Eisele
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE