(PC) James v. Mehta		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	CHARLES CORNELIUS JAMES,	
11	Plaintiff,	No. 2:10-cv-1171 LKK DAD P
12	VS.	
13	DEEPAK MEHTA, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	<u>ORDER</u>
15	/	
16	Counsel on behalf of both parties have submitted to the court a joint motion to	
17	modify the scheduling order in this action. In the motion, counsel explain that they were under	
18	the impression that they could not proceed with discovery until the court entered a discovery	
19	order, which it did only recently. In addition, plaintiff may be able to locate defendant Uppal,	
20	and there is a possibility that the court will grant defendant Capitano's pending motion to set	
21	aside entry of default.	
22	Under these circumstances, and good cause appearing, the court will vacate the	
23	current scheduling order and re-set a schedule for this litigation according to the parties'	
24	proposed scheduling dates. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b).	
25	/////	
26	/////	
		1

Doc. 76

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The parties' joint motion to modify the scheduling order (Doc. No. 75) is granted. 2. The court's July 31, 2012 scheduling order is vacated. 3. The parties shall disclose any expert witnesses on or before February 28, 2013. The parties shall complete all non-expert discovery on or before March 29, 2013, and complete all expert discovery on or before April 30, 2013. 4. The parties shall file any dispositive, non-discovery motions on or before June 28, 2013. Any motion so filed shall be briefed pursuant to Local Rule 230. 5. The court will set pretrial conference and trial dates, as appropriate, following adjudication of any dispositive motion or the expiration of time for filing such a motion. DATED: August 7, 2012. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE DAD:9 jame1171.41aty(2)