

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JOHN SHARP, et al.,)	Case No.: 1:15-cv-01162 JLT
Plaintiffs,)	ORDER AMENDING CASE SCHEDULE
v.)	
ERNEST DEAN SOEST, et al,)	
Defendants.)	
AND RELATED ACTIONS)	

At the mid-discovery status conference, counsel raised concerns that there was insufficient time to complete discovery in light of the fact that Mr. Soest has recently appeared in the action and filed a cross complaint and because of the new issue raised in the second matter filed by Mr. Soest—and recently consolidated with this action. Notably, Mr. Soest’s cross-complaint adds two parties, one of which is located in Dubai. Thus, good cause appearing, the Court **ORDERS**:

1. All non-expert discovery **SHALL** be completed no later than **June 30, 2016**;
2. All experts **SHALL** be disclosed no later than **July 22, 2016** and rebuttal experts by **August 19, 2016**. All expert discovery **SHALL** be completed by **September 16, 2016**;
3. A status conference is set on **May 20, 2016**. No later than **May 13, 2016**, counsel **SHALL** file a joint statement setting forth the status of discovery, including a description of the discovery completed and that which is still outstanding. The report **SHALL** also detail the efforts to

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

serve the cross-defendants in the cross-complaint filed by Mr. Soest;

4. No separate case schedule will issue as to the Soest matter. Those parties **SHALL** to comply with the deadlines set forth in the case schedule (Doc. 41) as modified here and as may be modified in the future.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 25, 2016

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE