(PC) Marti v. Padilla, et al		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	Alex Lamota Marti,) Case No.: 1:07-CV-00066-JMR
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	vs.	
12	F. Padilla, et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	Pending before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Modify the Schedule (Doc. #156).	
16	Defendants request that the Court modify the schedule by staying any outstanding deadlines,	
17	particularly the December 23, 2009 deadline for Defendants' motion for summary judgment,	
18	pending full briefing and determination of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Misjoined	
19	Defendants and Sever Claims (Doc. #149). On December 15, 2009, the Court extended the	
20	deadline for Plaintiff's response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss to January 14, 2010.	
21	Defendants argue that a favorable ruling on their Motion to Dismiss could reduce the number	
22	of defendants and claims in this action and, in turn, reduce the scope of any motion for	
23	summary judgment. Because of this, Defendants claim that judicial economy will be served	
24	by first determining their Motion to Dismiss before requiring any filing of a motion for	
25	summary judgment.	
26	Accordingly, in the interest of judicial economy, and good cause having been shown,	
27		
28		

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Modify the Schedule (Doc. #156) is **GRANTED**. All outstanding deadlines are stayed, including the December 23, 2009 deadline for Defendants' motion for summary judgment, pending full briefing and determination of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Misjoined Defendants and Sever Claims (Doc. #149).

DATED this 22nd day of December, 2009.

John M. Roll

Chief United States District Judge