1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Philip C. Bourdette SBN 47492 Miriam Bourdette SBN 151980 BOURDETTE & PARTNERS 2924 West Main Street Visalia, CA 93291 (559) 625-8425 Fax (559) 625-8491 pcbb@bourdettelaw.com mrbb@bourdettelaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs Simona A. Farrise SBN 171708 Leigh A. Kirmsse SBN# 161929 Farrise Firm PC 225 South Olive St., Ste 102 Los Angeles, CA 90012 310-424-3355 FAX 510-588-4536 Sfarrise@farriselaw.com Ikirmsse@farriselaw.com Ikirmsse@farriselaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sharon J.Arkin SBN #154858 The Arkin Law Firm 333 South Grand Avenue, 25 <sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 (541) 469-2892 FAX: 866) 571-5676 sarkin@arkinlawfirm.com Attorney for Plaintiffs
19 20	
21	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22	
23	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
24	FRESNO DIVISION
25	
26	
27	
28	
	11

NANCY WADDELL,	Case No.: 1:04-cv-06343-JRG-DLB
Defendants.	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
( KAY UHALT and STEPHEN UHALT,	Case No.: 1:10-cv-02404-JRG-DLB
)	
Plaintiffs,	
VS. )	
WYETH LLC, et al.	
Defendants.	
)	
DOROTHY SETSER and HOWARD	Case No.: 1:10-cv-02405-JRG-DLB
SEISER,	
Plaintiffs,	
vs.	
) WYETH LLC, et al.	
)	
)	Case No.: 1:10-cv-02394-JRG-DLB
CAROL HILL and LEONARD HILL	0030 110. 1.10-07-02334-JNG-DLD
Plaintiffs,	
VS. )	
WYETH LLC. et al	
Defendants.	
2	
	Plaintiff,       vs.         WYETH LLC, et al.       Defendants.         KAY UHALT and STEPHEN UHALT,       Plaintiffs,         vs.       Plaintiffs,         vs.       WYETH LLC, et al.         Defendants.       Defendants.         DOROTHY SETSER and HOWARD SETSER,       Plaintiffs,         vs.       WYETH LLC, et al.         DOROTHY SETSER and HOWARD SETSER,       Plaintiffs,         vs.       WYETH LLC, et al.         Defendants       Defendants         CAROL HILL and LEONARD HILL       Plaintiffs,         vs.       WYETH LLC. et al         Defendants.       Defendants.

1 2	MARIANNE PHILLIPS and WILLIAM	) ) \ Case No.: 1:10-cv-02395-JRG-DLB
3	PHILLIPS,	) Case No. 1.10-00-02080-01\G-DLD
4	Plaintiffs,	ý )
5	VS.	)
6	WYETH LLC, et al.	)
7		) )
8	Defendants.	)
9	GLORIETTE MCPHERSON,	) Case No.: 1:10-cv-02384-JRG-DLB
10	Plaintiff,	)
11	VS.	)
12	WYETH LLC, et al.	)
13		) )
14	Defendants.	)
15 16	BETTY CRAVEN and GEORGE CRAVEN,	) ) Case No.: 1:10-cv-02382-JRG-DLB
17 18	Plaintiffs,	) )
19	VS.	)
20	WYETH LLC, et al.	)
21		ý )
22	Defendants.	)
23	SHIRLEY BOWLES and GERALD BOWLES,	) Case No.: 1:04-cv-06346-JRG-DLB
24	Plaintiffs,	)
25	VS.	)
26	WYETH LLC, et al.	)
27		)
28	Defendants.	)
	3	

1	DONNA HAMES and MICHAEL HAMES	) Case No.: 1:10-cv-02392-JRG-DLB
2		)
3	Plaintiffs,	)
4	VS.	)
5	WYETH LLC, et al.	)
6		, ) )
7	Defendants.	)
8 9	VICTORIA POOLE and DELBERT POOLE	) Case No.: 1:10-cv-02397-JRG-DLB
10	Plaintiffs,	)
11	VS.	)
12	WYETH LLC, et al.	, ) )
13		)
14	Defendants.	)
15		
16	ORDER RE MOTIONS TO MODIFY COU	URT'S SCHEDULING ORDERS
17 18	On January 10, 2012, counsel filed in each of	the above styled actions "Notice of
19	Motion to Modify Scheduling Order, Declaration	of Miriam Bourdette and (Proposed)
20	Order." The court construes the notices as motion	as to modify scheduling orders.
21	On December 12, 2011, I issued an order that	all counsel meet and confer regarding a
22	Joint Scheduling Order for the remand group 2 ca	ses. If counsel reached an agreement they
23 24	were to submit the proposed scheduling order to the	he court no later than January 16, 2012.
24	Counsel noted in the present motion that January	16, 2012, is Martin Luther King Day and
26	the courts are closed. This fact has no bearing on t	the directive to the parties to file a joint
27	scheduling order by that date. Filings can always	be made via CM/ECF on a court holiday.
28	Counsel further asserted they could not file the Jo	int Scheduling Order before that date

because the court would not have had time to consider this motion and rule on it. The first modification the parties seek, therefore, is to have an extension of time to prepare and file the Joint Scheduling Order so that the court could consider the other problems and suggestions. I hereby **GRANT** the motion on those grounds and **ORDER** the last day to file the proposed Joint Scheduling Order be continued to **January 23, 2012**.

Plaintiffs' counsel stated in the motion that they do not have the resources to try more than one case at a time, and prepare for the next, even with two firms engaged. They asserted that both firms are small firms and cannot hire or retain the many experienced trial lawyers that would be needed. Given that assertion, plaintiff's counsel requested that the trial dates for remand group 2 cases start after conclusion of the trial dates for remand group 1 and do not overlap.

Exhibit A, attached to the motion, included a table with proposed trial dates for all remanded cases. The trials still are limited to the 10 (ten) days the court ordered for each plaintiff and when possible start the day after the preceding trial, even when in the middle of the week. As to remand group 2 cases, the proposed schedule also took into account previously scheduled trials in the Northern District of California, San Jose Division before Judge Davila, as well as holidays occurring from October 2012 through April 2013. These include Veterans Day, Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Years, Martin Luther King Day and President's Day, on which the Courts are closed and Passover, which is on March 25–26, 2013.

Taking into account the holidays mentioned and previously scheduled trials before Judge Davila, trial dates for the above styled cases will proceed as follows:

1	• Waddell v. Wyeth, case number 1-04-cv-06343-JRG, trial dates October 22,
2	2012 – November 2, 2012;
3	• Uhalt v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02404-JRG, trial dates January 2, 2013-
5	January 15, 2013;
6	• Setser v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02405JRG, trial dates January 16, 2013-
7	January 30, 2013;
8	• Hill v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02394-JRG, trial dates January 31, 2013-
9	February 13, 2013;
10	1 coldary 13, 2013,
11	• Phillips v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02395-JRG, trial dates February 14,
12	2013 – February 28, 2013.
13	• McPherson v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02384-JRG, trial dates March 1,
14 15	2013 – March 14, 2013.
16	• Craven v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02382-JRG, trial dates March 15, 2013 –
17	April 1, 2013.
18	• Bowles v. Wyeth, case number 1-04-cv-06346-JRG, trial dates April 2, 2013 –
19	A 1115 2012
20	April 15, 2013.
21	• Hames v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02392-JRG, trial dates April 16, 2013 –
22	April 29, 2013.
23	• Poole v. Wyeth, case number 1-10-cv-02397-JRG, trial dates April 30, 2013 –
24	May 13, 2013.
25	Wiay 15, 2015.
26	
27	The trials will be no longer than 10 (ten) working days. After seven years of
28	discovery and extensive experience trying these cases there should be no "unforeseen

interference" for which the parties cannot adjust. If a case does not require the entire time allotted for trial after the evidence is complete, the next trial will start even if there is a deliberating jury in the preceding case. If a case settles prior to trial, the next scheduled case will immediately move up and commence on the trial dates established for the settling case. If any of the cases before Judge Davila in the Northern District of California, San Jose Division settle or the trial dates are condensed in any manner the next trial on the this schedule will be moved up accordingly.

**IT IS SO ORDERED:** 

Dated: January 12, 2012

seph R. Goodwin, Chief Judge