

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AMERIPRIDE SERVICES, INC.,
A Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

VALLEY INDUSTRIAL SERVICE, INC.,
a former California corporation,
et al.,

Defendants.

NO. CIV. S-00-113 LKK/JFM

O R D E R

AND CONSOLIDATED ACTION AND
CROSS- AND COUNTER-CLAIMS.

On November 7, 2011, the parties in the above captioned case filed a joint statement regarding discovery disagreements and Defendant TEO's request to amend the scheduling order to permit TEO's filing of a motion to compel the production of documents. Joint Statement, ECF No. 797. Plaintiff AmeriPride opposes TEO's request to amend the scheduling order for the purposes of filing a motion to compel. Id.


1 According to this court's Status (pretrial scheduling) Order,
2 by May 1, 2011, "all discovery shall have been conducted so that
3 all depositions have been taken and any disputes relative to
4 discovery shall have been resolved by appropriate order." Order,
5 ECF No. 695, at 5. The scheduling order further provides that
6 "[m]otions to compel discovery must be noticed on the magistrate
7 judge's calendar in accordance with the local rules of this court
8 and so that such motions will be heard not later than April 1,
9 2011." Id. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b), the
10 pretrial scheduling order shall not be modified except by leave of
11 court upon a showing of good cause. FED. R. CIV. P. 16(b)(4).

12 The court finds no good cause to amend the scheduling order
13 and, thus, DENIES Defendant TEO's request to amend the scheduling
14 order for the purposes of filing a motion to compel.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: November 14, 2011.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26


LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT