

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
FRESNO DIVISION

NANCY WADDELL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

WYETH LLC, et al.

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:04-cv-06343-JRG-DLB

ORDER RELATING TO THE  
PARTIES' JOINT STATUS REPORT

KAY UHALT and STEPHEN UHALT,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

WYETH LLC, et al.

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02404-JRG-DLB

DOROTHY SETSER and HOWARD SETSER,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

WYETH LLC, et al.

Defendants

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02405-JRG-DLB

CAROL HILL and LEONARD HILL

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02394-JRG-DLB

1 WYETH LLC. et al )  
2 Defendants. )

3 )  
4 )  
5 MARIANNE PHILLIPS and WILLIAM )  
6 PHILLIPS, )  
7 Plaintiffs, )  
8 vs. )  
9 WYETH LLC, et al. )  
10 Defendants. )

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02395-JRG-DLB

11 GLORINETTE MCPHERSON, )  
12 )  
13 Plaintiff, )  
14 vs. )  
15 WYETH LLC, et al. )  
16 )  
17 Defendants. )

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02384-JRG-DLB

18 BETTY CRAVEN and GEORGE CRAVEN, )  
19 )  
20 Plaintiffs, )  
21 vs. )  
22 WYETH LLC, et al. )  
23 )  
24 Defendants. )

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02382-JRG-DLB

25 SHIRLEY BOWLES and GERALD BOWLES, )  
26 Plaintiffs, )  
27 vs. )  
28 WYETH LLC, et al. )

Case No.: 1:04-cv-06346-JRG-DLB

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Defendants.

DONNA HAMES and MICHAEL HAMES

Plaintiffs,

vs.

WYETH LLC, et al.

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02392-JRG-DLB

VICTORIA POOLE and DELBERT POOLE

Plaintiffs,

vs.

WYETH LLC, et al.

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:10-cv-02397-JRG-DLB

LOIS ZANYK

Plaintiff,

vs.

PFIZER INC., et al.

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:10-cv-00287-JRG-DLB

CARLEEN WEST

Plaintiff,

vs.

PFIZER INC., et al.

Case No.: 1:10-cv-00289-JRG-DLB

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_)  
PAMELA TURNER )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
PFIZER INC., et al. )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

Case No.: 1:10-cv-00288-JRG-DLB

LUCILLE MACIAS )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. )  
)  
PFIZER INC., et al. )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

Case No.: 1:10-cv-00282-JRG-DLB

I have considered the Joint Status Report [ECF 55] filed by the parties in these actions. The parties state that they need 30 to 60 days to finalize the resolution of these cases and, therefore, propose a deadline of 60 days in which to file a joint motion to dismiss the above cases, or, in the alternative, file a joint status report informing the court as to the status of resolution of the cases. I find the parties’ proposal unacceptable. As I indicated at a status conference on December 9, 2011, “these cases are seven years old .... There have been orders entered ... and they’ve all been extended two or three times.” [1:04-cv-06343-JRG-DLB, ECF 36, pp. 5, 8.] I stated very clearly that “this process stops today. We’re going to set a firm scheduling order and we’re going to take these cases to trial.” *Id.* at 8. On January 20, 2012, I entered a scheduling order in these cases, setting trials to begin on October 22, 2012. [1:04-cv-06343-JRG-DLB, ECF 46.]

In April of 2012, the parties advised me the cases had settled and that they requested vacation of the scheduling order and 60 days to set a status conference. By order entered April 24, 2012, I vacated all trial and pre-trial deadlines in the above actions and ordered the parties to

1 file a joint status report within 60 days informing me as to the resolution of these cases, or in the  
2 alternative, to file a joint motion to dismiss. [ECF 54.] The parties now seek an additional 60  
3 days within which to file a joint motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, file a joint status report  
4 informing me as to the status of resolution.

5 In light of the number of delays in these cases preceding settlement, the representation by  
6 the parties in April, 2012, that these matters have settled, and the fact that the parties have already  
7 requested one extension, which I granted, I am not willing to extend this matter out further. It is  
8 **ORDERED** that the parties shall file a joint motion to dismiss within 30 days of entry of this  
9 order. If the parties do not file a joint motion to dismiss within 30 days, the court will enter a new  
10 scheduling order in this matter with court chosen deadlines, including a trial date in the coming  
11 months.

12 ENTER: July 5, 2012

13   
14 Joseph R. Goodwin, Chief Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28