1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
9							
10	MARTHINA TAYLOR,	)	1: 15-CV-01607 - LJO - JLT				
11	Plaintiff,	)	SCHEDULING ORDER (Fed. R. Civ. P. 16)				
12	v.	)	Pleading Amendment Deadline: 5/9/2016				
13	NORTHERN INYO HOSPITAL, et al.,	)					
14	Defendants.	)	Discovery Deadlines: Non-Expert: 11/14/2016				
15		)	Expert: 1/13/2017 Mid-Discovery Status Conference:				
16		,	6/28/2016 at 8:30 a.m.				
17			Non-Dispositive Motion Deadlines:				
18			Filing: 1/23/2017 Hearing: 2/21/2017				
19			Dispositive Motion Deadlines:				
20			Filing: 3/10/2017				
21			Hearing: 5/9/2017				
22			Pre-Trial Conference: 7/11/2017 at 8:30 a.m.				
23			Courtroom 4				
24			Trial: 9/12/2017 at 8:30 a.m.				
25			Courtroom 4 Jury trial: 7-10 days				
26							
27							
28							
	1	1					

1 2 3

4

5

### I. Date of Scheduling Conference

February 9, 2016.

II. <u>Appearances of Counsel</u>

Leonard Sansanowicz appeared on behalf of Plaintiff.

Andrea Douglas appeared on behalf of Defendants.

6

7

III.

Magistrate Judge Consent:

### Notice of Congested Docket and Court Policy of Trailing

B Due to the District Judges' heavy caseload, the newly adopted policy of the Fresno Division of
the Eastern District is to trail all civil cases. The parties are hereby notified that for a trial date set
before a District Judge, the parties will trail indefinitely behind any higher priority criminal or older
civil case set on the same date until a courtroom becomes available. The trial date will not be reset to a
continued date.

The Magistrate Judges' availability is far more realistic and accommodating to parties than that
of the U.S. District Judges who carry the heaviest caseloads in the nation and who must prioritize
criminal and older civil cases over more recently filed civil cases. A United States Magistrate Judge
may conduct trials, including entry of final judgment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Federal Rule of
Civil Procedure 73, and Local Rule 305. Any appeal from a judgment entered by a United States
Magistrate Judge is taken directly to the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit.

The Fresno Division of the Eastern District of California, whenever possible, is utilizing United
States Article III District Court Judges from throughout the nation as Visiting Judges. Pursuant to the
Local Rules, Appendix A, such reassignments will be random, and the parties will receive no advance
notice before their case is reassigned to an Article III District Court Judge from outside of the Eastern
District of California.

Therefore, Defendants are directed to consider consenting to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction to
conduct all further proceedings, including trial. <u>Within 10 days</u> of the date of this order, counsel
SHALL file a consent/decline form (provided by the Court at the inception of this case) indicating
whether they will consent to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge.

28

///

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

# IV. <u>Pleading Amendment Deadline</u>

Any requested pleading amendments are ordered to be filed, either through a stipulation or motion to amend, no later than **May 9, 2016**.

V. <u>Discovery Plan and Cut-Off Date</u>

The parties have exchanged the initial disclosures required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1). The parties are ordered to complete all discovery pertaining to non-experts on or before

**November 14, 2016**, and all discovery pertaining to experts on or before **January 13, 2017**.

The parties are directed to disclose all expert witnesses<sup>1</sup>, in writing, on or before **November 28**, **2016**, and to disclose all rebuttal experts on or before **December 19**, **2016**. The written designation of retained and non-retained experts shall <u>be made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 26(a)(2), (A), (B),</u> <u>and (C) and shall include all information required thereunder</u>. Failure to designate experts in compliance with this order may result in the Court excluding the testimony or other evidence offered through such experts that are not disclosed pursuant to this order.

The provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(4) and (5) shall apply to all discovery relating to experts
and their opinions. Experts must be fully prepared to be examined on all subjects and opinions
included in the designation. Failure to comply will result in the imposition of sanctions, which may
include striking the expert designation and preclusion of expert testimony.

The provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e) regarding a party's duty to timely supplement
disclosures and responses to discovery requests will be strictly enforced.

A mid-discovery status conference is scheduled for **June 28, 2016** at 8:30 a.m. before the Honorable Jennifer L. Thurston, U.S. Magistrate Judge, located at 510 19<sup>th</sup> Street, Bakersfield, California, 93301. A Joint Mid-Discovery Status Conference Report, carefully prepared and executed by all counsel, shall be electronically filed in CM/ECF, one full week prior to the Conference, and shall be e-mailed, in Word format, to JLTorders@caed.uscourts.gov. The joint statement SHALL outline the discovery that has been completed and that which needs to be completed as well as any impediments to

26

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In the event an expert will offer opinions related to an independent medical or mental health
 <sup>a</sup> evaluation, the examination SHALL occur sufficiently in advance of the disclosure deadline so the expert's report fully details the expert's opinions in this regard.

completing the discovery within the deadlines set forth in this order. Counsel may appear 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.

## VI. Pre-Trial Motion Schedule

All non-dispositive pre-trial motions, including any discovery motions, shall be filed no later than **January 23, 2017**, and heard on or before **February 21, 2017**. Non-dispositive motions are heard before the Honorable Jennifer L. Thurston, United States Magistrate Judge at the United States Courthouse in Bakersfield, California.

No written discovery motions 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 by agreement the issues in dispute. If that good faith effort is unsuccessful, the moving party promptly shall seek a telephonic hearing with all involved parties and the Magistrate Judge. It shall be the obligation of the moving party to arrange and originate the conference call to the court. To schedule this telephonic hearing, the parties are ordered to contact Courtroom Deputy Clerk, Susan Hall at (661) 326-6620 or via email at SHall@caed.uscourts.gov. <u>Counsel must comply with</u>

# 5 Local Rule 251 with respect to discovery disputes or the motion will be denied without prejudice 7 and dropped from calendar.

In scheduling such motions, the Magistrate Judge may grant applications for an order shortening time pursuant to Local Rule 144(e). However, if counsel does not obtain an order shortening time, the notice of motion must comply with Local Rule 251.

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.

All dispositive pre-trial motions shall be filed no later than March 10, 2017, and heard no later
than May 9, 2017, in Courtroom 4 at 8:30 a.m. before the Honorable Lawrence J. O'Neill, United
States District Court Judge. In scheduling such motions, <u>counsel shall comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 56</u>
and Local Rules 230 and 260.

28

///

 $\begin{array}{c|c}1\\2\end{array}$ 

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

19

#### VII. Motions for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication

At least 21 days before filing a motion for summary judgment or motion for summary adjudication, the parties are **ORDERED** to meet, in person or by telephone, to confer about the issues to be raised in the motion.

The purpose of the meeting shall be to: 1) avoid filing motions for summary judgment where a question of fact exists; 2) determine whether the respondent agrees that the motion has merit in whole or in part; 3) discuss whether issues can be resolved without the necessity of briefing; 4) narrow the issues for review by the court; 5) explore the possibility of settlement before the parties incur the expense of briefing a summary judgment motion; and, 6) to develop a joint statement of undisputed facts.

The moving party SHALL initiate the meeting and SHALL provide a complete, proposed
statement of undisputed facts <u>at least five days before</u> the conference. The finalized joint statement of
undisputed facts SHALL include all facts that the parties agree, for purposes of the motion, may be
deemed true. In addition to the requirements of Local Rule 260, the moving party shall file the joint
statement of undisputed facts.

In the notice of motion the moving party SHALL certify that the parties have met and conferred
as ordered above, or set forth a statement of good cause for the failure to meet and confer. <u>Failure to</u>
comply may result in the motion being stricken.

# **VIII.** <u>Pre-Trial Conference Date</u>

20 July

July 11, 2017, at 8:30 a.m. in Courtroom 4 before Judge O'Neill.

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 O'Neill's chambers, by email at LJOorders@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.

1	IX. <u>Trial Date</u>				
2	September 12, 2017, at 8:30 a.m. in Courtroom 4 before the Honorable Lawrence J. O'Neill,				
3	United States District Court Judge.				
4		A. This is a jury trial.			
5		B. Counsels' Estimate of Trial Time: 7-10 days.			
6		C. Counsels' attention is directed to Local Rules of Practice for the Eastern District of			
7	Califo	rnia, Rule 285.			
8	X. <u>Settlement Conference</u>				
9		If the parties desire a settlement conference with the Court, they may file a joint written request			
10	for a conference. At that time, a settlement conference will be set with the assigned Magistrate Judge.				
11	XI.	Request for Bifurcation, Appointment of Special Master, or other			
12		Techniques to Shorten Trial			
13		Not applicable at this time.			
14	XII.	Related Matters Pending			
15		There are no pending related matters.			
16	XIII.	Compliance with Federal Procedure			
17		All counsel are expected to familiarize themselves with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure			
18	and th	e Local Rules of Practice of the Eastern District of California, and to keep abreast of any			
19	amendments thereto. The Court must insist upon compliance with these Rules if it is to efficiently				
20	handle its increasing case load and sanctions will be imposed for failure to follow both the Federal				
21	Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of Practice for the Eastern District of California.				
22	XIV.	Effect of this Order			
23		The foregoing order represents the best estimate of the court and counsel as to the agenda most			
24	suitable to dispose of this case. The trial date reserved is specifically reserved for this case. If the				
25	parties determine at any time that the schedule outlined in this order cannot be met, counsel are ordered				
26	to notify the court immediately of that fact so that adjustments may be made, either by stipulation or by				
27	subsequent status conference.				
28					

1	The dates set in this Order are considered to be firm and will not be modified absent a					
2	showing of good cause even if the request to modify is made by stipulation. Stipulations					
3	extending the deadlines contained herein will not be considered unless they are accompanied by					
4	affidavits or declarations, and where appropriate attached exhibits, which establish good cause					
5	for granting the relief requested.					
6	Failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions.					
7						
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.					
9	Dated:	<b>February 9, 2016</b>	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston			
10			UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						