1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	STAN BITTERS, et al.,	No. 1:14-CV-1646 KJM SMS
12	Plaintiffs,	
13	V.	AMENDED STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) ORDER
14	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, et al.,	SCHEDOLING) ORDER
15	Defendants.	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18		
19	An initial scheduling conference was held in this case on May 14, 2015. Sara	
20	Hedgpeth-Harris appeared for plaintiff; Stephen Onstot appeared for defendant City of Fresno;	
21	Judith Carlson appeared for defendants California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) and	
22	Malcolm Dougherty. On May 28, 2015, the parties filed a joint motion to clarify the court's	
23	May 20, 2015 Status Order.	
24	The court makes the following orders:	
25	I. SERVICE OF PROCESS	
26	All named defendants have been served and no further service is permitted without	
27	leave of court, good cause having been shown.	
28	/////	1

II. ADDITIONAL PARTIES/AMENDMENTS/PLEADINGS

No further joinder of parties or amendments to pleadings is permitted without leave of court, good cause having been shown. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b); Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604 (9th Cir. 1992).

III. JURISDICTION/VENUE

Jurisdiction is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

The City of Fresno does not contest venue or this court's subject matter jurisdiction over the First, Second, and Third Causes of Action as federal questions. The City does contend that supplemental jurisdiction over the Fourth Cause of Action is inappropriate.

IV. DISCOVERY

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

The first three claims are brought under the judicial review provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 701-706, and are exempted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1)(B)(i) from the initial disclosure requirements of Rule 26(a) and from the discovery-planning requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f).

Because the fourth claim may entail discovery and retention of experts, as agreed by the parties, the court STAYS discovery as to the fourth claim until after briefing and hearing on the first three claims.

V. MOTION PRACTICE

The court understands plaintiff may seek a preliminary injunction prior to the start of construction, including demolition, of the Fulton Street Mall. The parties may also seek to brief collateral estoppel once an appellate matter pending in state court is resolved.

All motion practice, other than summary judgment practice addressed below, will be governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of this court, and this court's standing order.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD AND CROSS MOTIONS

CalTrans is in the process of determining the content of and preparation time for the Administrative Record in this case. The administrative record will be filed with the court /////

no later than June 26, 2015, and all cross-motions for summary judgment are to be filed no later than August 21, 2015. All litigation of claim four is STAYED and further scheduling dates deferred until such time as the court has resolved the first three claims. MODIFICATION OF STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) ORDER VII. The parties are reminded that pursuant to Rule 16(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order shall not be modified except by leave of court upon a showing of good cause. Agreement by the parties pursuant to stipulation alone does not constitute good cause. Except in extraordinary circumstances, unavailability of witnesses or counsel does not constitute good cause. VIII. OBJECTIONS TO STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) ORDER This Status Order will become final without further order of the court unless objections are filed within fourteen (14) calendar days of service of this Order. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: June 1, 2015.