1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JAMES LORAN QUINN,	Case No. 1:10-cv-01617 LJO BAM
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE MOTIONS TO AMEND THE
13	VS.	PRETRIAL ORDER
14	FRESNO COUNTY SHERIFF, et al.,	(Docs. 124 & 129)
15	Defendants.	
16	/	
17	Pending before the Court are two motions filed by Plaintiff to amend the pretrial order. First,	
18	on July 25, 2012, Plaintiff moved to include Wade Mangiarelli in his trial witness list. In response, the	
19	Court indicated that Plaintiff's request would be granted on condition that Wade Mangiarelli would be	
20	made available for deposition by no later than August 1, 2012, and that Plaintiff would pay the cost of	
21	obtaining expedited deposition transcripts. These conditions were aimed at curing any prejudice that	
22	Defendants might incur as a result of Plaintiff's late addition. On July 31, 2012, Plaintiff notified the	
23	Court that he agreed to the conditions and that the parties had stipulated to holding Wade Mangiarelli's	
24	deposition on August 1, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. <sup>1</sup> Accordingly, Plaintiff's July 25, 2012, ex parte motion to	
25	amend the pretrial order (Doc. 124) is GRANTED.	
26	<sup>1</sup> In its order, the Court instructed Plaintiff to file and	serve notice of whether he agreed to the Court's conditions
27	by no later than <b>noon on July 30. 2012</b> . (Doc. 128 at 3.) Plai	

by no later than noon on July 30, 2012. (Doc. 128 at 3.) Plaintiff, however, did not notify the Court of his decision until one day past the deadline, on July 31, 2012. This is the second time the Court has had to admonish Plaintiff's counsel for failing to abide by Court deadlines. (See Doc. 103 at 6.) Plaintiff's counsel is placed on notice that any further untimeliness on his part will be grounds for sanctions.

1	Second, on July 27, 2012, Plaintiff moved to include the deposition testimony of Dr. Khoi Lee		
2	and Dr. Lorie DeCarvalho in his list of discovery documents that may be used at trial. On July 31, 2012,		
3	Defendants responded that they do not oppose Plaintiff's motion so long as their counter-designations		
4	to the deposition testimony are accepted one day late. <sup>2</sup> Good cause appearing and seeing no prejudice		
5	to either party, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's July 27, 2012, ex parte motion to amend the pretrial order		
6	(Doc. 129), and accepts Defendants' counter-designations.		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
19	Dated: August 3, 2012 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill   UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
20			
21			
22			
23 24			
24 25			
23 26			
20 27			
28			
	<sup>2</sup> The deadline for counter-designations was set for July 30, 2012.		
	2		