on February 29, 2012. ////

25

26

Doc. 193

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

However, the discovery deadlines in this case (both expert and non-expert), which were extended multiple times, expired more than a year ago. As set forth in the district judge's original Pretrial Scheduling Order, the discovery deadline is the date on which all discovery is to be "completed," which "means that all discovery shall have been conducted so that all depositions have been taken and any disputes relative to discovery shall have been resolved by appropriate order if necessary and, where discovery has been ordered, the order has been complied with." See May 18, 2009 Pretrial Scheduling Order, Dckt. No. 20 at 2.

Therefore, defendant's motion to compel, Dckt. No. 192, and the portions of both plaintiff and defendant's motions seeking discovery sanctions, Dckt. Nos. 191 and 192, are denied since this court has no authority to consider discovery motions after the close of discovery.² Additionally, the February 29, 2011 hearing on the remainder of the parties' motions (plaintiff's motion to strike defendant's supplemental expert report and motion for sanctions for violation of the district judge's scheduling order, and defendant's motion for sanctions for violation of the court's orders) is vacated. If the parties desire to re-notice those motions, they shall notice the motions before the assigned district judge and shall comply with Local Rule 230.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 7, 2012.

EDMUND F. BRENNAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The non-expert discovery deadline expired on September 10, 2010, and the deadline for completing expert discovery expires sometime before the November 15, 2010 dispositive motion deadline. See Dckt. No. 104 at 4-5 (providing third parties until September 10, 2010 to respond to outstanding subpoenas and providing that "[t]he parties will complete all discovery of expert witnesses in a timely manner in order to comply with the deadline for filing dispositive motions"); see also Dckt. Nos. 100, 166.

² The parties may file a motion to further modify the Pretrial Scheduling Order, but that motion must be heard and decided by the district judge.