UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORLANDO JESUS BENAVIDES, Plaintiff, v. CITY OF ARVIN, STEVEN SCHMICK, et al., Defendants.	)))))))))	Case No.1:12 -CV - 00405 LJO JLT ORDER GRANTING IN PART STIPULATION TO AMEND THE SCHEDULING ORDER (Doc. 26)

Before the Court is the stipulation of the parties to amend the scheduling order. (Doc. 26) The parties report they are scheduled to mediate this case on August 1, 2013 and, apparently, wish determine whether the matter will settle before expending additional costs. Id. at 3. Counsel seek a four-week extension on all remaining dates except for the settlement conference, pretrial conference and trial dates. Id. at 3-4.

Unfortunately, the dates proposed are not workable for the Court. Thus, the stipulation is **GRANTED in PART.**

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing, the Court **ORDERS** the scheduling order to be amended as follows:

1. Expert disclosure **SHALL** occur no later than **August 26, 2013**;
2. Rebuttal expert disclosure **SHALL** occur no later than **September 9, 2013**;

3. All discovery related to experts **SHALL** be completed no later than **September 30, 2013**.

No other amendments to the scheduling order are authorized.[1]

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **July 29, 2013**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

[1] The Court appreciates the desire to defer efforts to draft a dispositive motion until after mediation efforts are attempted. However, given his extensive caseload, continuing the deadline for filing and hearing the motion as requested, would not provide Judge O'Neill sufficient time to decide the motion before the pretrial conference. Should the parties wish to consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction, Magistrate Judge Thurston would be able to decide a dispositive motion in less time given her smaller caseload.