

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

11 WENDY CENIS, an individual,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 WINCO HOLDINGS, INC., a corporation;
15 BRANDON RODGERS, an individual; and
DOES 1 through 25, inclusive.

16 Defendants.
17

Case No.: 1:17-CV-00863-DAD-JLT

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART
STIPULATION TO CONTINUE EXPERT
WITNESS DISCLOSURE AND EXPERT
WITNESS RELATED DISCOVERY**

(Doc. 40)

18 The parties have stipulated to delay expert discovery until after the Court has ruled on the
19 motion and cross-motion for summary judgment. (Doc. 40) The purpose of the stipulation is to
20 preserve resources expended on experts until it is determined that they are needed. *Id.* at 2.

21 However, the proposed schedule amendments would have expert discovery completed after the
22 pretrial conference¹. *Id.* at 3. This is not the orderly progression of the case the Court requires.

23 Thus, the Court **ORDERS** the case schedule amended as follows:

24 1. The parties SHALL disclose their experts no later than three weeks after the Court
25 rules on the competing motions for summary judgment but in no event shall experts be disclosed
26

27 ¹ The proposed schedule anticipates that there will be no disputes related to experts given that the do not seek to
28 amend this deadline and, by the time experts are disclosed, the deadline for filing discovery motions will be long-since
expired (Doc. 25 at 3). Though the Court questions the wisdom of this approach, this is the option of the parties.

1 later than March 16, 2018. Rebuttal experts SHALL be disclosed three weeks thereafter but no
2 later than April 6, 2018. Expert discovery SHALL be completed four weeks after the deadline for
3 disclosure of rebuttal experts but no later than May 4, 2018.

4 2. **No other amendments to the case schedule are authorized.**

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: **October 19, 2017**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE