

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 LAMAR SINGLETON, SR.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 DR. FORTUNE, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16

1:17-cv-00124-DAD-GSA-PC

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER  
(ECF No. 47.)

ORDER EXTENDING DISCOVERY  
DEADLINE AND DEADLINE TO FILE  
DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS FOR ALL  
PARTIES

**New Discovery Deadline: 10/30/17**

**New Dispositive Motions Deadline: 12/29/17**  
18  
19

20 **I. BACKGROUND**

21 Lamar Singleton, Jr., (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma*  
22 *pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case now proceeds  
23 with the First Amended Complaint filed on February 19, 2016, against defendant Fortune  
24 (“Defendant”) on Plaintiff’s medical claim pursuant to the Eighth Amendment. (ECF No. 25.)

25 On March 17, 2017, the court issued a Discovery and Scheduling Order establishing  
26 pretrial deadlines for the parties, including a deadline of August 17, 2017, for the parties to  
27 complete discovery, including the filing of motions to compel, and a deadline of October 16,  
28 2017, for the filing of pretrial dispositive motions. (ECF No. 43.)

1 On June 21, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion to modify the scheduling order to extend the  
2 discovery deadline for sixty days. (ECF No. 47.) Defendant has not opposed the motion.

3 **II. MOTION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER**

4 Modification of a scheduling order requires a showing of good cause, Fed. R. Civ. P.  
5 16(b), and good cause requires a showing of due diligence, Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations,  
6 Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). To establish good cause, the party seeking the  
7 modification of a scheduling order must generally show that even with the exercise of due  
8 diligence, they cannot meet the requirement of the order. Id. The court may also consider the  
9 prejudice to the party opposing the modification. Id. If the party seeking to amend the  
10 scheduling order fails to show due diligence the inquiry should end and the Court should not  
11 grant the motion to modify. Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison, Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087  
12 (9th Cir. 2002).

13 Plaintiff requests a sixty-day extension of the deadline to complete discovery, due to  
14 medical issues and lack of access to his legal documents. Plaintiff declares that his medical  
15 condition, a tumor on his kidney, has been causing him severe pain, and that he is awaiting a  
16 second opinion from the oncologist about his treatment. The court finds that Plaintiff has  
17 shown that even with the exercise of due diligence, he cannot meet the discovery deadline  
18 established in the court's Discovery and Scheduling Order. Therefore, the court finds good  
19 cause to extend the discovery deadline and the dispositive motions deadlines for all parties to  
20 this action.

21 Good cause appearing, the discovery deadline shall be extended to October 30, 2017,  
22 for all parties to this action, and the dispositive motions deadlines shall be extended to  
23 December 29, 2017, for all parties to this action. Any further requests for extension of  
24 deadlines should be filed before the expiration of the existing deadlines.

25 **III. CONCLUSION**

26 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 27 1. Plaintiff's motion to modify the court's Discovery and Scheduling Order, filed  
28 on June 21, 2017, is GRANTED;

1 ///  
2

- 3 2. The deadline for the completion of discovery, including the filing of motions to  
4 compel, is extended from August 17, 2017, to **October 30, 2017**, for all parties  
5 to this action;
- 6 3. The deadline for filing and serving pretrial dispositive motions is extended from  
7 October 16, 2017, to **December 29, 2017**, for all parties to this action; and
- 8 4. All other provisions of the Court's March 17, 2017, Discovery and Scheduling  
9 Order remain the same.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: **August 6, 2017**

12 **/s/ Gary S. Austin**  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28