1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	RONALD TIMBERLAND,	1:16-cv-00922-LJO-GSA-PC			
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S			
13	vs.	MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER (ECF No. 41.)Defendants.ORDER EXTENDING DEADLINES FOR ALL PARTIES			
14	G. MASCARENAS, et al.,				
15	Defendants.				
16		New Discovery Deadline:	10/09/19		
17		<u>New</u> Dispositive Motions Deadline:	12/09/19		
18					
19					

I. BACKGROUND

Ronald Timberland ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action now proceeds with Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, filed on June 20, 2018, against defendant G. Mascarenas (Correctional Counselor I) for failure to protect Plaintiff in violation of the Eighth Amendment.¹ (ECF No. 26.)

On January 9, 2019, the court issued a Discovery and Scheduling Order establishing pretrial deadlines for the parties, including a deadline of July 9, 2019, for the parties to complete

¹ On October 12, 2018, the court issued an order dismissing all other claims and defendants from this action based on Plaintiff's failure to state a claim. (ECF No. 30.)

discovery, including the filing of motions to compel; and, a deadline of September 9, 2019, for the filing of pretrial dispositive motions. (ECF No. 37.) The parties were advised that all discovery requests must be served at least 60 days before the discovery deadline. (<u>Id.</u> at 2:6.) This case is now in the discovery phase.

On May 23, 2019, Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to serve his requests for admission and requests for production of documents. The court construes the motion as a motion to modify the scheduling order issued on January 9, 2019.

|| **II**.

MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER

Modification of a scheduling order requires a showing of good cause, Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b), and good cause requires a showing of due diligence, Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). To establish good cause, the party seeking the modification of a scheduling order must generally show that even with the exercise of due diligence, they cannot meet the requirement of the order. Id. The court may also consider the prejudice to the party opposing the modification. Id. If the party seeking to amend the scheduling order fails to show due diligence the inquiry should end and the court should not grant the motion to modify. Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison, Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002).

Plaintiff requests an extension of the discovery deadline so that he can timely serve his requests for admission and requests for production of documents. Plaintiff asserts that he was able to timely serve his interrogatories and to file the motion for extension of time. However, despite his best efforts, Plaintiff asserts that he was unable to meet the deadline for serving all of his discovery requests because he did not have access to his personal property or the law library due to prison lockdowns and other delays beyond his control.

Defendant has not opposed Plaintiff's motion and the time for filing an opposition has expired. Local Rule 230(l).

Good cause appearing, Plaintiff's motion shall be granted. The discovery deadline shall be extended to October 9, 2019, for all parties to this action, and the dispositive motions deadline shall be extended to December 9, 2019, for all parties to this action. Any further requests for extension of deadlines should be filed before the expiration of the existing deadlines.

1	III. CONCLUSION				
2	Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:				
3		1.	Plaintiff's motion to modify the court's Discovery and Scheduling Order, filed on		
4			issued on May 23, 2019, is GRANTED;		
5		2.	The deadline for the completion of discovery, including the filing of motions to		
6			compel, is extended from July 9, 2019, to October 9, 2019, for all parties to this		
7			action;		
8		3.	3. The deadline for filing and serving pretrial dispositive motions is extended from		
9	September 9, 2019, to December 9, 2019 , for all parties to this action; and				
10		4.	All other provisions of the court's January 9, 2019, Discovery and Scheduling		
11			Order remain the same.		
12					
13	11 18 2	SO OR	DERED.		
14	Da	ted:	June 18, 2019/s/ Gary S. AustinUNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
15			UNITED STATES WAODSTRATE JUDGE		
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
			3		