

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL A. HUNT,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
M. REYES, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:08-cv-0181 MCE CKD P

ORDER


Plaintiff has filed a motion to file additional discovery requests. (ECF No. 111.)  
Discovery in this action has long been closed. (ECF No. 48.) Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
Procedure 16(b), a scheduling order “may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's  
consent.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The “good cause” standard “primarily considers the diligence  
of the party seeking the amendment.” Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609  
(9th Cir. 1992). The district court may modify the scheduling order “if it cannot reasonably be  
met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension.” Id. Here, the court does not find  
good cause to reopen discovery as plaintiff requests.

///  
///  
///

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT plaintiff's motion for relief (ECF No. 111) is denied.

Dated: October 31, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2 / hunt.0181.modify