

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
2 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

3 **ROBERT FELIX and JACK PHELPS,**  
4 **individuals,**

5 **Plaintiffs,**

6 **v.**

7 **THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,**  
8 **DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL**  
9 **SERVICES, OFFICE OF PROTECTIVE**  
10 **SERVICES, *et al.*,**

11 **Defendants.**

12 **1:13-cv-00561 LJO SKO**

13 **ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO**  
14 **CONTINUE PRETRIAL**  
15 **CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATE**  
16 **(Doc. 30)**

17 The Court has carefully reviewed the Parties' stipulation for an order continuing the trial date  
18 and pretrial dates. Doc. 30. Due to this Court's impacted calendar, it will only reschedule trial dates if  
19 good cause is shown. The Court does not believe the parties have made such a showing. This is not an  
20 extraordinarily complex matter. The current discovery deadlines, set at a September 16, 2013 scheduling  
21 conference, provided the Parties with approximately one year to complete discovery. The parties have  
22 not presented any compelling reason why an additional year is needed. Nor have the parties presented  
23 any compelling reason why the scheduling of mediation "on or about December[] 2014 to February[]  
24 2015" warrants continuing the pretrial conference or trial date, currently set for May 7, 2015 and June  
25 23, 2015, respectively. Accordingly, the request to continue the pretrial conference and trial date is  
26 DENIED. The Court will defer to the Magistrate Judge as to whether there is good cause to modify any  
of the other deadlines, including the dispositive motions deadline. Alternatively, the Parties are  
encouraged to reconsider consent to the Magistrate Judge, whose schedule is far more accommodating  
than the undersigned's.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 28, 2014

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE