-JLT (PC)Williams v. Cate, et al.			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	EASTERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	ALLEN B. WILLIAMS,) CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00468 LJO JLT PC	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER VACATING TRIAL DATE; TRIAL	
13	V.) CONFIRMATION DATE AND ALL) DEADLINES SET FORTH IN THE THIRD	
14	MATTHEW CATE, et al.,) SCHEDULING ORDER;	
15	Defendant.	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO AMEND DISCOVERY AND SCHEDULING ORDER	
16) (Docs. 102, 103)	
17			
18	I. <u>Procedural History</u>		
19	Plaintiff Allen B. Williams ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma		
20	pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 4 2 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 29, 2011, the Court		
21	issued its Third Scheduling Order. (Doc. 99) Despite that this matter has been pending for nearly		
22	three years, Plaintiff now moves for an order amending the Third Scheduling Order and continuing		
23	the trial date, to allow identification and location of key witnesses and other pretrial preparation.		
24	(Doc. 103) Likewise, Defendants request that the trial date be vacated to allow the filing of a		
25			
26			
27			
28			
		1	

Doc. 104

1	1	4'	
1	1	tion ¹ and because Defendant Bradley has been deployed to Afghanistan on a year-	
2	long contract.	(Doc. 102) Plaintiff reports that he has spoken with defendants counsel about	
3	Defendants' re	quest to continue the trial date and Plaintiff concurs with this request. (Doc. 103 at 2)	
4		ORDER	
5	In light	of Defendant Bradley's military deployment, the Court ORDERS :	
6	1.	The trial date, currently set on March 6, 2012 is VACATED ;	
7	2.	The trial confirmation hearing, currently set on February 3, 2012 is VACATED ;	
8	3.	All deadlines set forth in the Third Scheduling Order are VACATED;	
9	4.	Defendants' request to amend the Discovery and Scheduling Order is GRANTED .	
10		Any dispositive motion SHALL be filed no later than February 24, 2012;	
11	5.	Defendants SHALL file a status report related to Defendant Bradley's military	
12		service, including such details as when he is expected to return from his military	
13		duty and whatever other information is pertinent within 30 days of service of this	
14		order.	
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
16	Dated: Janu	ary 12, 2012 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
17		UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	1 Though	the motion concludes that good cause has been shown to modify the scheduling order to allow the	
26	late filing of a dispositive motion, this conclusion is supported by the mere fact that the currently assigned attorney has realized that the previously assigned attorney had not filed such a motion. This is not good cause as, clearly, this		
27	failure is nothing short of a failure to exercise due diligence. <u>Johnson v. Mammoth recreations, Inc.</u> , 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). However, because the Court cannot proceed while Defendant Bradley is on active military duty		
28	the Court will permit a short amount of time to file a dispositive motion.		
	II.		