| 1 | | | | | | |
|--------|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| 9 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | | |
| 10 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | | |
| 11 | HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00914-LJO-SKO | | | | | |
| 12 | COMPANY, ORDER DENYING STIPULATED | | | | | |
| 13 | REQUEST TO MODIFY THE SCHEDULING ORDER | | | | | |
| 14 | Plaintiff, | | | | | |
| 15 | v. | (Docke | : No. 111) | | | |
| 16 | AMERICAN DAIRY AND FOOD | | | | | |
| 17 | CONSULTING LABORATORIES, | | | | | |
| 18 | Defendant. | | | | | |
| 19 | AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM. | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | |
| 22 | On October 17, 2011, the parties filed a request to modify the scheduling order so that they | | | | | |
| 23 | would have additional time to complete discovery. (Doc. 111.) The parties request the following | | | | | |
| 24 | changes: | | | | | |
| 25 | Deadline | Current Deadline | Proposed Deadline | | | |
| 26 | 1. Non-Expert Discovery | October 20, 2011 | December 20, 2011 | | | |
| 27 | 2. Expert Disclosure | October 24, 2011 | December 23, 2011 | | | |
| 28 | 3. Supp. Exp. Discl. | November 14, 2011 | January 13, 2012 | | | |

| 1 | 4. | Exp. Discovery | December 5, 2011 | February 5, 2012 |
|---|-----|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 2 | 5. | Non-Disp. Filing Deadline | October 24, 2011 | December 23, 2011 |
| 3 | 6. | Non-Disp. Motion Hearing | November 18, 2011 | January 20, 2012 |
| 4 | 7. | Disp. Mot. Filing Deadline | November 3, 2011 | January 6, 2012 |
| 5 | 8. | Disp. Motion Hearing | January 9, 2012 | March 12, 2012 |
| 6 | 9. | Settlement Conference | December 13, 2011 | February 14, 2012 |
| 7 | 10. | Pretrial Conference | January 23, 2012 | March 26, 2012 |
| 8 | 11. | Trial Date | March 6, 2012 | May 8, 2012 |

The proposed deadlines do not leave the Court with sufficient time between the dispositive motion hearing date and the pretrial conference for the Court to consider and make a determination on any pending motions.

The Court is willing to accommodate the parties' request for a modified schedule, but cannot adopt the dates proposed in the stipulation. If the parties wish to re-file their request for an extension of the schedule, they should propose dates that maintain at least six weeks between the hearing date for the dispositive motions and the pretrial conference date as well as at least six weeks between the date of the pretrial conference and the date of the trial. Further, any proposed pretrial conference date should fall on either a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9

10

11

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Dated: <u>October 17, 2011</u>

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE