| 1<br>2<br>3 | DANA A. SUNTAG (State Bar #125127)<br>JOSHUA J. STEVENS (State Bar # 238105)<br>ZOEY P. MERRILL (State Bar #268331)<br>THE SUNTAG LAW FIRM<br>A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION |   |
|-------------|--|---|
| 4           | The Kress Building<br>20 North Sutter Street, Fourth Floor   |   |
| 5           | Stockton, California 95202<br>Telephone: (209) 943-2004<br>Facsimile: (209) 943-0905   |   |
| 6           | MATTHEW P. DACEY (State Bar #196943)   |   |
| 7<br>8      | OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL OF SAN JOAQUIN  |   |
| 9           | 44 North San Joaquin Street, Suite 679<br>Stockton, California 95202<br>Telephone: (209) 468-2980  |   |
| 10          | Attorneys for All Defendants   |   |
| 11          |  |   |
| 12          | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |   |
| 13          | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |   |
| 14          |  |   |
| 15          | JERRY LUM, etc., et al.,   | NO. 2:10-CV-01807-LKK-DAD                       |
| 16          | Plaintiffs,  | STIPULATION AND ORDER                           |
| 17          | V.   | ) EXTENDING DISCOVERY<br>) DEADLINE TO COMPLETE |
| 18          | COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN, et al.,   | ) SPECIFIC DEPOSITIONS                          |
| 19          | Defendants.  | ) [F.R.C.P. 16(b)(4)]                           |
| 20          |  | [No hearing required]                           |
| 21          |  |   |
| 22          |  |   |
| 23          |  |   |
| 24          |  |   |
| 25          |  |   |
| 26          |  |   |
| 27          |  |   |
| 28          |  |   |
|             | STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER<br>EXTENDING DISCOVERY DEADLINE TO<br>COMPLETE SPECIFIC DEPOSITIONS   |   |
|             |  | Dockets.Ju                                      |

1 This stipulation and proposed order is entered into between Plaintiffs Jerry 2 Lum and Dorothea Timmons (collectively "Plaintiffs"), on the one hand, and Defendants 3 County of San Joaquin, City of Lathrop, Ray Walters, Steven Pease, Robert Davis, and Felipe Mendoza (collectively "Defendants"), on the other hand. 4 5 RECITALS 6 Α. On October 31, 2012, the Court granted a prior stipulation entered 7 into between the parties extending the discovery cut-off date from December 31, 2012 8 to January 31, 2012. 9 Β. Plaintiffs have conducted nine depositions. Plaintiffs have noticed 10 the depositions of six of defendants' expert witnesses, all of which are scheduled to be 11 conducted between January 17 and January 27, 2012. C. 12 Defendants have conducted eight depositions, including the 13 depositions of two of plaintiffs' four expert witnesses. In addition, Defendants have 14 noticed the depositions of another seven percipient witnesses scheduled to be 15 conducted by January 23, 2012. 16 D. Plaintiffs timely disclosed Charles Saldanha, M.D. as their expert in 17 the area of psychology/psychiatry. Dr. Saldanha's deposition was initially scheduled to 18 be conducted on January 6, 2012. On January 5, 2012, due to plaintiffs' counsel's 19 unexpected illness, the parties were forced to cancel Dr. Saldanha's deposition last 20 minute. Due to the last-minute cancellation and Dr. Saldanha's limited availability for 21 the remainder of January, the parties are having great difficulties finding a mutually-22 agreeable date, prior to the January 31, 2012 discovery cut-off, within which to depose 23 Dr. Saldanha. 24 E. Plaintiffs timely disclosed M. Patricia Fisher as their handwriting 25 expert; however, due to a late-resolution of the parties' disagreements regarding 26 plaintiffs' access to certain original documents within the possession, custody and 27 control of the San Joaquin Sheriff's Department, Ms. Fisher was unable, until the 28 STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER 2 EXTENDING DISCOVERY DEADLINE TO COMPLETE SPECIFIC DEPOSITIONS

afternoon of December 30, 2011, to access documents necessary to formulating her
 expert opinions in the case. Since then, in light of the parties' already full deposition
 schedule in January, and Ms. Fisher's limited availability, the parties are having
 difficulties finding a mutually agreeable date, prior to the January 31, 2012 discovery
 cut-off, within which to depose Ms. Fisher.

F. Despite great effort, Defendants have had significant difficulty in
locating and serving a deposition subpoena on Andrew Lum. Andrew Lum is the brother
of decedent Jeremy Lum and was disclosed in plaintiffs' initial disclosures as having
information pertaining to events leading up to Jeremy Lum's arrest. Defendants wish to
depose Andrew Lum.

G. The parties have agreed that, given the above delays, in light of
the diligent efforts made by both sides to complete discovery, the discovery cut-off date
for defendants to conduct the depositions of Charles Saldanha, M.D., M. Patricia Fisher,
and Andrew Lum should be extended to February 29, 2012, to give defendants the
necessary time to complete their discovery.

H. This extension is only sought for purposes of completing these
three specific depositions. The parties are not requesting that any other deadline be
modified.

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER EXTENDING DISCOVERY DEADLINE TO COMPLETE SPECIFIC DEPOSITIONS 

| 1  | STIPULATION  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  | IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED, by the parties, through their counsel                                 |  |
| 3  | of record, that the discovery cut-off be extended to February 29, 2012, only to allow              |  |
| 4  | defendants to conduct and complete the depositions of Charles Saldanha, M.D., M.                   |  |
| 5  | Patricia Fisher, and Andrew Lum.   |  |
| 6  | Dated: January 13, 2012 THE SUNTAG LAW FIRM<br>A Professional Corporation                          |  |
| 7  |  |  |
| 8  | By: <u>/s/ Dana A. Suntag</u><br>DANA A. SUNTAG  |  |
| 9  | Attorneys for All Defendants   |  |
| 10 | Dated: January 13, 2012 WALKER, HAMILTON & KOENIG LLP  |  |
| 11 |  |  |
| 12 | By: <u>/s/ Peter J. Koenig</u><br>PETER J. KOENIG  |  |
| 13 | Attorneys for All Plaintiffs   |  |
| 14 | <u>O R D E R</u>   |  |
| 15 | The parties are free to stipulate among themselves concerning the timing                           |  |
| 16 | of depositions. However, the court will not enforce any such agreements. The motion                |  |
| 17 | to extend the discovery deadline is DENIED.  |  |
| 18 | It is so ordered.  |  |
| 19 | Dated: January 20, 2012.   |  |
| 20 |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |
| 22 | Javnie K Kerton  |  |
| 23 | LAWRENCE K. KARLTON<br>SENIOR JUDGE  |  |
| 24 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |
| 25 |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |
|    | STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER<br>EXTENDING DISCOVERY DEADLINE TO<br>COMPLETE SPECIFIC DEPOSITIONS |  |
|    |  |  |