1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 DEMOND HAMMOND, 10 1: 13-CV-01209-AWI - JLT Plaintiff, 11 FURTHER SCHEDULING ORDER 12 Briefing related to MTC's duties: **MANAGEMENT & TRAINING** Filing deadline: 2/24/2017 13 CORPORATION, Reply deadline: 3/17/2017 14 Defendant. Expert Discovery Deadline: 3/13/2017 15 Non-Dispositive Motion Deadlines: 16 Filing: 3/27/2017 17 Hearing: 4/24/2017 18 Pre-Trial Conference: 6/28/2017 at 10:00 a.m. 19 Courtroom 2 20 Trial: 9/12/2017 at 8:30 a.m. 21 Courtroom 2 Jury trial: 3-5 days 22 23 On January 3, 2017, the parties filed a Joint Status Report following the remand from the Ninth 24 Circuit. On January 9, 2017, the Court held a further scheduling conference with the parties, which 25 agreed to comply with the following deadlines for the remainder of the action. 26 T. **Briefing** 27 As noted by the parties, the Ninth Circuit remanded the matter "to proceed to trial on the issue 28 of whether MTC unreasonably failed to undertake actions to reduce the inmates' risk of infection."

(Doc. 75 at 4) In addition, the Court was "instructed to determine whether there is a genuine issue of material fact as to whether MTC breached its duty to warn as a possessor of land." (*Id.*) The parties SHALL file briefing on this issue no later than **February 24, 2017**. Any briefs in reply **SHALL** be filed no later than **March17, 2017**.

II. Expert Discovery

The parties have already disclosed experts but have not yet conducted expert discovery. They **SHALL** complete all discovery related to experts no later than **March 13, 2017**.

III. Pre-Trial Motion Schedule

The parties have agreed to continue expert discovery. Any non-dispositive pre-trial motions related to the expert discovery shall be filed no later than **March 27, 2017**, and heard on or before **April 24, 2017**. Non-dispositive motions are heard at 9:00 a.m., before the Honorable Jennifer L. Thurston, United States Magistrate Judge, at the United States District Courthouse located at 510 19th Street, Bakersfield, California.

No written motions related to the expert discovery shall be filed without the prior approval of the assigned Magistrate Judge. A party with a discovery dispute must first confer with the opposing party in a good faith effort to resolve the issues in dispute. If that good faith effort is unsuccessful, the party shall seek a telephonic hearing with all involved parties and the Magistrate Judge, by contacting the Courtroom Deputy Clerk, Susan Hall, at (661) 326-6620 or via email at SHall@caed.uscourts.gov.

Counsel must comply with Local Rule 251 with respect to discovery disputes or the motion will be denied without prejudice and dropped from calendar.

Counsel may appear and argue non-dispositive motions via CourtCall, providing a written request to so appear is made to the Magistrate Judge's Courtroom Clerk no later than five court days before the noticed hearing date.

IV. Pre-Trial Conference Date

June 28, 2017, at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 2 before Judge Ishii.

The parties are ordered to file a **Joint Pretrial Statement pursuant to Local Rule 281(a)(2)**. The parties are further directed to submit a digital copy of their pretrial statement in Word format, directly to Judge Ishii's chambers, by email at AWIOrders@caed.uscourts.gov.

Counsels' attention is directed to <u>Rules 281 and 282 of the Local Rules</u> of Practice for the Eastern District of California, as to the obligations of counsel in preparing for the pre-trial conference. The Court will insist upon strict compliance with those rules. In addition to the matters set forth in the Local Rules the Joint Pretrial Statement shall include a Joint Statement of the case to be used by the Court to explain the nature of the case to the jury during voir dire.

V. Trial Date

September 12, 2017, at 8:30 a.m. in Courtroom 2 before the Honorable Anthony W. Ishii, United States District Court Judge.

- A. This is a jury trial.
- B. Counsels' Estimate of Trial Time: 3-5 days.
- C. Counsels' attention is directed to Local Rules of Practice for the Eastern District of California, Rule 285.

VI. Settlement Conference

If the parties believe the action is in a settlement posture and a conference with the Court would be fruitful, they may file a joint written request for a settlement conference, proposing dates with at least thirty days' notice. At that time, notwithstanding the requirements of Local Rule 270(b), the settlement conference will be conducted by Magistrate Judge Thurston. The Court deems the deviation from the Local Rule to be appropriate and in the interests of the parties and justice and sound case management based upon the location of the parties. If any party prefers that the settlement conference be conducted by a different judicial officer, that party is directed to notify the Court no later than 60 days in advance of the scheduled settlement conference to allow sufficient time for another judicial officer to be assigned to handle the conference.

VII. Effect of this Order

The foregoing order represents the best estimate of the court and counsel as to the agenda most suitable to dispose of this case. If the parties determine at any time that the schedule outlined in this order cannot be met, counsel are ordered to notify the court immediately of that fact so that adjustments may be made, either by stipulation or by subsequent status conference.

The dates set in this Order are considered to be firm and will not be modified absent a

1	showing of good cause even if the request to modify is made by stipulation. Failure to comply with		
2	this order may result in the imposition of sanctions.		
3			
4	IT IS SO O	RDERED.	
5	Dated:	January 10, 2017	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
6			UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			