

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAPHAEL MUNOZ, et al.,) Case No.: 1:09-cv-00703-AWI-JLT
Plaintiffs,) FURTHER SCHEDULING ORDER
v.)
GIUMMARA VINEYARDS CORPORATION,)
Defendant.)
) _)

On April 16, 2014, the Court held a further scheduling conference. After conferring with counsel and reviewing the parties' joint status report, the Court sets the following case schedule:

- 1. Merits discovery related to non-experts SHALL be completed no later than **February 16, 2015**. The provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e) regarding a party's duty to timely supplement disclosures and responses to discovery requests will be strictly enforced;
- 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary adjudication SHALL be filed no later than **September** 19, 2014;
- 3. A further status conference is set on **October 1, 2014** at 9:00 a.m. Telephonic appearances via CourtCall are authorized. At that time, counsel SHALL be expected to discuss the discovery completed to date and that needed to be completed as well as the discovery needed to be conducted related to the issues raised by the motion for summary adjudication. At that time, the Court

will determine the deadline for the filing of the opposition to the motion and Defendant's cross-motion for summary adjudication.

4. The dates set herein are intended to be firm and the Court expects compliance with the deadlines absent good cause. However, the Court anticipates that a stay will likely be needed to allow the determination of the cross motions for summary adjudication. Moreover, given that there are many unknowns at this point, if a deadline cannot be met despite due diligence, counsel SHALL meet and confer to attempt to come to agreement as to any discovery or scheduling issue and, as necessary, involve the Court in informal telephonic conferences. All counsel are expected to take whatever steps are necessary to move the case forward as expeditiously as possible.

Failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 17, 2014 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ In the event of a stay, counsel are reminded that the Court will expect that whatever time is remaining for merits discovery will be "tolled" and, once the stay is lifted, only that time remaining for the merits discovery will be allowed. Thus, any needed non-expert discovery that can be taken before the determination of the motions for summary adjudication should be taken before the determination of the motions for summary adjudication.