

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

MIRIAM MICHELLE MENDOZA,)	Case No.: 1:16-cv-00967 - LJO - JLT
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART STIPULATION
)	TO AMEND THE CASE SCHEDULE
v.)	(Doc. 25)
)	
GENERAL MOTORS LLC, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The parties have stipulated to amend the case schedule as to all remaining dates except the pretrial conference and the trial dates. (Doc. 25 at 2-3) They explain that the amendment is needed because of delays in seeking and producing the GM LLC corporate representative for deposition. Id. at 2. They assert that they need to extend expert discovery because “they prefer to complete fact and party witness depositions before serving expert disclosures and reports, as this will facilitate completeness of expert reports.”¹ Id. Likewise, they assert that the case schedule should be amended as to non-expert discovery “to facilitate the orderly progress of discovery” but fail to explain why they are unable to complete non-expert discovery by the current deadline of October 2, 2017, give the corporate deposition will occur a full month earlier and they offer no

¹ Despite this, the schedule counsel propose requires the plaintiff to disclose her experts a month before the close of their proposed deadline for non-expert discovery. Thus, the Court is at a loss to understand exactly what the motivation is for the stipulation—other than providing counsel additional time to complete discovery that, apparently, they did not pursue earlier.

1 further description of outstanding discovery needs.

2 Notably, in their joint mid-discovery status conference, filed on July 3, 2017, they indicated
3 that the bulk of their discovery would be completed by the beginning of August and that “[t]he
4 parties do not currently anticipate any impediments to [completing] discovery.” (Doc. 23 at 2)
5 Also left unexplained is why, despite that the case was scheduled in October 2016, the parties
6 waited until July to conduct the needed depositions. Finally, the case schedule the parties propose
7 in their stipulation—while providing them significant additional time to complete discovery—fails
8 to provide sufficient time for the needed Court actions including determining motions. Therefore,
9 the Court **ORDERS**:

10 1. The stipulation to amend the case schedule is **GRANTED in PART** as follows:

11 a. All non-expert discovery **SHALL** be completed no later than **October 30,**
12 **2017;**

13 b. The plaintiff **SHALL** disclose her experts no later than **November 3, 2017**
14 and the defendant **SHALL** disclose its experts no later than **November 29, 2017**. Plaintiff may
15 disclose rebuttal experts no later than **December 22, 2017;**

16 c. All expert discovery **SHALL** be completed no later than **January 19, 2018;**

17 d. Non-dispositive motions, if any, **SHALL** be filed no later than **January 26,**
18 **2018** and heard no later than **February 23, 2018;**

19 2. As to the requests to amend the dispositive motion filing deadline and associated
20 hearing date and as to the specific proposed schedule agreed upon by counsel, the stipulation is
21 **DENIED.**

22 **Absolutely no other amendments to the case schedule are authorized. The parties are**
23 **urged, once again (See Doc. 24), to complete their discovery of this case expeditiously. The**
24 **Court does not contemplate entertaining any further requests to amend the case schedule.**

25
26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: August 15, 2017

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE