| 1 | ANTHONY T. CASO, No. 88561 Law Office of Anthony T. Caso | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------|
| 2 | 8001 Folsom Boulevard, Suite 100 Sacramento, California 95826 | |
| 3 | Telephone: (916) 386-4432 Facsimile: (916) 307-5164 | |
| 4 | E-Mail: tom@caso-law.com | |
| 5 | Attorney for David Blanton | |
| 6 | LONGYEAR, O'DEA AND LAVRA, LLP John A. Lavra, CSB No. 114533 | |
| 7 | Jeri L. Pappone, CSB No. 210104 Amy B. Lindsey-Doyle CSB No. 242205 | |
| 8 | 3620 American River Drive, Suite 230 Sacramento, CA 95864 | |
| 9 | Telephone: (916) 974-8500 | |
| 10 11 | Attorneys for Defendants County of Sacramento, Sacramento County Sher Department, Chris Bittle, Donald Bricker, and K | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 14 | EASTERN DISTR | ICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | DAVID BLANTON, | Case No.: 2:09-CV-01832-MCE-KJM |
| 17 | Plaintiff,) | STIPULATION AND ORDER TO AMEND |
| 18 | V.) COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO | THE SCHEDULING ORDER |
| 19 | COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,) SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S) DEPARTMENT, CHRIS BITTLE, DONALD) | |
| 20 | BRICKER, KENNETH KING, and) CRYSTAL FISCHER BRADNAX,) | |
| 21 | Defendants. | |
| 22 | / | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | Plaintiff and Defendants County of Sacramento (erroneously sued as the Sacramento County | |
| 25 | Sheriff's Department), Chris Bittle, Donald Bricker and Kenneth King by and through their | |
| 26 | respective counsel hereby stipulate and request changes to the current Status (Pretrial Scheduling) | |
| 27 | Order. Defendant Crystal Fischer Bradnax was served via substituted service on September 23, | |
| 28 | 2010, and has yet to appear in this action. | |
| | Stipulation to Amend Scheduling Order – No. 2:09-CV-01832-MCE-KJM | |
| | | |

| 1 | Good cause exists for the modification to permit the Plaintiff to take properly noticed |
|----|--|
| 2 | depositions that due to scheduling conflicts of the parties and their counsel cannot occur until after |
| 3 | the current discovery deadline of August 4. Defendants have already conducted written discovery |
| 4 | and taken the deposition of Plaintiff, thereby completing its intended discovery. Plaintiff has timely |
| 5 | propounded his written discovery and timely noticed certain depositions. Counsel have met and |
| 6 | conferred and in accommodation of the witnesses schedules and the schedules of counsel, the |
| 7 | properly noticed depositions cannot occur until after August 4. |
| 8 | In order to facilitate agreement between the parties on the scheduling of remaining |
| 9 | depositions, the parties stipulate to a change in the court's scheduling order as follows: |
| 10 | 1. No new discovery will be propounded after July 5, 2011. |
| 11 | 2. Depositions properly noticed prior to the current discovery deadline of August 4, 2011 |
| 12 | may be taken after said deadline to accommodate scheduling conflicts; |
| 13 | 3. The discovery cutoff for obtaining and enforcing discovery motions related to depositions |
| 14 | as identified within paragraph 2 above shall be 60 days following the final deposition. |
| 15 | 4. All other discovery, including any motions related to any written discovery are subject to |
| 16 | the current discovery cut off of August 4, 2011. |
| 17 | |
| 18 | DATED: June 24, 2011. |
| 19 | Respectfully submitted, |
| 20 | ANTHONY T. CASO |
| 21 | |
| 22 | /s/ ANTHONY T. CASO Attorney for Plaintiff |
| 23 | |
| 24 | LONGYEAR, O'DEA AND LAVRA, LLP |
| 25 | <u>/s JOHN LAVRA</u> Attorneys for Defendants, County of Sacramento, |
| 26 | Chris Bittle, Donald Bricker, and Kenneth King |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| | Stipulation to Amend Scheduling Order – No. 2:09-CV-01832-MCE-KJM |

| 1 | ORDER |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | Based on the stipulation between the parties, the scheduling order is hereby amended as |
| 4 | follows: |
| 5 | 1. No new discovery will be propounded after July 5, 2011. |
| 6 | 2. Depositions properly noticed prior to the current discovery deadline of August 4, 2011 |
| 7 | may be taken up to sixty (60) days following said deadline to accommodate scheduling |
| 8 | conflicts; |
| 9 | 3. The discovery cutoff for obtaining and enforcing discovery motions related to depositions |
| 10 | as identified within paragraph 2 above shall be sixty (60) days following the final deposition. |
| 11 | 4. All other discovery, including any motions related to any written discovery, are subject to |
| 12 | the current discovery cut off of August 4, 2011. |
| 13 | IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 14 | DATE: June 28, 2011 |
| 15 | Moun Ol |
| 16 | MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR. |
| 17 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| | Stipulation to Amend Scheduling Order – No. 2:09-CV-01832-MCE-KJM 3 |
| | |