1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 KIMBERLY WHITEHEAD, 1:17-CV-01204- LJO- JLT 11 Plaintiff, SCHEDULING ORDER (Fed. R. Civ. P. 16) 12 v. Initial disclosures: 12/18/2017 LIBERTY LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY 13 Administrative Record Deadlines: OF BOSTON, 14 Filing: 1/8/2018 Objections/motions to supplement: Defendant. 15 1/24/2018 16 Discovery Cut-Off: 4/2/2018 17 Briefing Deadlines: 18 Opening briefs: 4/16/2018 Oppositions: 5/14/2018 19 Reply briefs: 6/4/2018 20 Hearing: 7/31/2018 at 8:30 a.m. Courtroom 4 21 Mediation deadline: 3/30/2018 22 23 24 I. **Information Concerning the Court's Schedule** 25 Out of fairness, the Court believes it is necessary to forewarn litigants that the Fresno Division 26 of the Eastern District of California now has the heaviest District Court Judge caseload in the entire 27 nation. While the Court will use its best efforts to resolve this case and all other civil cases in a timely

manner, the parties are admonished that not all of the parties' needs and expectations may be met as

28

II.

III. <u>Discovery Plan and Cut-Off Date</u>

Pleading Amendment Deadline

The parties agree no pleading amendments will occur.

The parties are ordered to exchange the initial disclosures required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)

expeditiously as desired. As multiple trials are now being set to begin upon the same date, parties may find their case trailing with little notice before the trial begins. The law requires that the Court give any criminal trial priority over civil trials or any other matter. The Court must proceed with a criminal trial even if a civil trial was filed earlier and set for trial first. Continuances of any civil trial under these circumstances will no longer be entertained, absent a specific and stated finding of good cause. All parties should be informed that any civil trial set to begin during the time a criminal trial is proceeding will trail the completion of the criminal trial.

The parties are reminded of the availability of a United States Magistrate Judge to conduct all proceedings in this action. A United States Magistrate Judge is available to conduct trials, including entry of final judgment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 28 U.S.C. 636(c), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 73, and Local Rule 305. The same jury pool is used by both United States Magistrate Judges and United States District Court Judges. Any appeal from a judgment entered by a United States Magistrate Judge is taken directly to the United States Court of Appeal for the Ninth Circuit. However, the parties are hereby informed that no substantive rulings or decisions will be affected by whether a party chooses to consent.

Finally, the Fresno Division of the Eastern District of California, whenever possible, is utilizing United States Article III District Court Judges from throughout the nation as Visiting Judges. Pursuant to the Local Rules, Appendix A, reassignments will be random, and the parties will receive no advance notice before their case is reassigned to an Article III District Court Judge from outside of the Eastern District of California.

Therefore, the parties are directed to consider consenting to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction to conduct all further proceedings, including trial. Within 10 days of the date of this order, counsel SHALL file a consent/decline form (provided by the Court at the inception of this case) indicating whether they will consent to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge.

on or before December 18, 2017.

The parties are ordered to complete all discovery pertaining on or before **April 2, 2018**.

IV. Administrative record

Defendant **SHALL** file the administrative record no later than **January 8, 2018**. Defendants need not provide a courtesy paper copy but **SHALL** provide a searchable electronic copy to the chambers of Judge O'Neill. Moreover, the parties **SHALL** file excerpts of the record in connection with their motion/cross motion for summary judgment.

Objections or a motion to supplement the record **SHALL** be filed no later than **January 24**, **2018**, and heard no later than **February 21**, **2018**.

No objections or motion to supplement shall be filed without the prior approval of the assigned Magistrate Judge. Plaintiff **SHALL** confer with the opposing party in a good faith effort to resolve the issues in dispute. If that good faith effort is unsuccessful, Plaintiff promptly **SHALL** seek a telephonic hearing with all involved parties and the Magistrate Judge. It is the obligation of Plaintiff to arrange and originate the conference call to the Court. To schedule this telephonic hearing, the parties are ordered to contact Courtroom Deputy Clerk, Susan Hall at (661) 326-6620 or via email at SHall@caed.uscourts.gov.

V. Briefing Schedule

Prior to filing the cross motions for summary judgment the parties are **ORDERED** to meet, in person or by telephone, and confer to discuss the issues to be raised in the motion <u>at least 21 days</u> <u>prior</u> to the filing of the motion. The purpose of the meeting shall be to: 1) determine whether the respondent agrees that the motion has merit in whole or in part; 2) discuss whether issues can be resolved without the necessity of briefing; 3) narrow the issues for review by the court; 4) explore the possibility of settlement before the parties incur the expense of briefing a summary judgment motion; 5) to arrive at a joint statement of undisputed facts.

In addition to the requirements of Local Rule 260, the parties **SHALL** file a joint statement of undisputed facts and each party **SHALL** file excerpts of the record which are cited in each party's briefs. **The parties are strongly urged to file a joint excerpt**.

In the notice of motion, the moving parties **SHALL** certify that they have met and conferred as

ordered above, or set forth a statement of good cause for the failure to meet and confer.

The parties' opening briefs on the cross motions for summary judgment **SHALL** be filed no later than **April 16, 2018**, and oppositions to the motion **SHALL** be filed no later than **May 14, 2018**. Any briefs in reply **SHALL** be filed no later than **June 4, 2018**. The hearing on the cross motions is SET for **July 31, 2018** at 8:30 a.m. in Courtroom 2 before the Honorable Lawrence O'Neill, United States District Court Judge.¹

VI. Mediation

The parties do not seek a settlement conference at this time, and intend to pursue private mediation which **SHALL** be completed no later than **March 30, 2018**.

VII. Compliance with Federal Procedure

All counsel are expected to familiarize themselves with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of Practice of the Eastern District of California, and to keep abreast of any amendments thereto. The Court must insist upon compliance with these Rules if it is to efficiently handle its increasing case load, and sanctions will be imposed for failure to follow both the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of Practice for the Eastern District of California.

VIII. Effect of this Order

The foregoing order represents the best estimate of the court and counsel as to the agenda most suitable to dispose of this case. The trial date reserved is specifically reserved for this case. If the parties determine at any time that the schedule outlined in this order cannot be met, counsel are ordered to notify the court immediately of that fact so that adjustments may be made, either by stipulation or by subsequent status conference.

The dates set in this Order are considered to be firm and will not be modified absent a showing of good cause even if the request to modify is made by stipulation. Stipulations extending the deadlines contained herein will not be considered unless they are accompanied by affidavits or declarations, and where appropriate attached exhibits, which establish good cause for granting the relief requested.

¹ Because the parties believe the matter will be resolve on dispositive motion, the Court does not set a pretrial conference or trial date.

Failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: **December 11, 2017**