

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

ANAMARIA GONZALEZ LOPEZ, et al.)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-0864 AWI JLT
)	
Plaintiffs,)	ORDER GRANTING STIPULATION TO AMEND
)	THE CASE SCHEDULE
v.)	(Doc. 22)
)	
COUNTY OF KERN, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The parties have stipulated to amend the case schedule once again.¹ (Doc. 28) The need for the amendment is not clear. Counsel indicate they intend to schedule several depositions to occur sometime within the next few weeks. Id. at 3. Likewise, the plaintiffs would like to amend their complaint to add at least one additional defendant. Id. Counsel seek additional time to file amended pleadings and to complete non-expert discovery.

Though counsel assert that they have acted diligently to discover this case, there is little evidence of this in the stipulation. Except for a couple of depositions, it does not appear that much discovery has occurred since December. (Compare Doc. 22 and Doc. 26). Though counsel anticipate taking additional depositions, the stipulation fails to demonstrate why the remaining

¹ The Court has twice before amended the case scheduled based upon the stipulation of counsel (Docs. 23, 27)

1 depositions cannot be completed within the current deadline—more than 60 days hence.² However,
2 because this amendment will not impact the remaining case dates, the Court **GRANTS** the
3 stipulation as follows:

- 4 1. All non-expert discovery **SHALL** be completed by **July 30, 2018**;
- 5 2. Any motions to amend or stipulations to amend **SHALL** be filed, if at all, by **May 1,**
6 **2018.**

7 **Counsel should not file any future stipulations to amend the case schedule that fail to**
8 **demonstrate extraordinary good cause; they will be summarily denied.**

9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: **April 19, 2018**

12 **/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston**
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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

² Counsel report that scheduling has been difficult because plaintiffs' counsel is located in Pasadena; why this location poses a difficulty is unclear. Plaintiffs' counsel had to have known at the time they took on this case that the case's venue would require travel. If the need for travel wasn't a concern then, it cannot be one now.