1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 BEL AIR MART, et al., No. 2:10-cv-02392-MCE-EFB 12 Plaintiffs. 13 **ORDER** ٧. 14 ARNOLD CLEANERS, INC. et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 In September 2010, Plaintiffs Bel Air Mart and Wong Family Investors, L.P. 18 (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), filed this environmental cleanup action against numerous 19 Defendants. Plaintiffs seek recovery for property damage and cleanup costs caused by 20 contamination from a dry cleaning facility ("the Facility") formerly operated on the real 21 property located at the southeast corner of Arden Way and Eastern Avenue in 22 Sacramento, California (the "Property"). This case was stayed on multiple occasions, 23 notably from October 6, 2011, to January 31, 2012, from June 4, 2012 to October 31, 24 2012, and from June 5, 2013, until October 31, 2013. See, e.g., ECF No. 198. 25 Discovery in this case is ongoing and currently closes on July 25, 2014. See PTSO, 26 ECF No. 202. 27 On May 19, 2014, Bel Air Mart, Wong Family Investors, L.P., R. Gern Nagler as 28 Trustee of the John W. Burns Testamentary Trust, Robert Gern Nagler, Ralph 1

1	Armstrong, Yolanda Panattoni, Arnold Cleaners, Inc., Han Hoi Joo, Chang Sun Joo,
2	Peter Kim, and The Estate of Ronald G. Armstrong, Deceased, by and through its
3	alleged insurer Century Indemnity Company, as successor to CCI Insurance Company,
4	as successor to Insurance Company of North America, pursuant to California Probate
5	Code section 550 et seq., (collectively, "Requesting Parties") jointly stipulated to an
6	extension of the deadlines set forth in this Court's Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order,
7	ECF No. 202, by approximately two months. ECF Nos. 255, 257. The Requesting
8	Parties request additional time to conserve "their limited financial resources while they
9	pursue a global settlement of this litigation." ECF No. 257. Defendant Arrowood
10	Indemnity Company, as alleged insurer of The Estate of Elise G. Burns, Deceased, and
11	The Estate of John W. Burns, Deceased, ("Arrowood"), opposes the Requesting Parties
12	application. ECF No. 256. <sup>2</sup>
13	The Court finds that good cause exists to modify the Amended Pretrial Schedulin
14	Order for a relatively brief extension of approximately two months. The Requesting

g Parties' application, ECF No. 255, is GRANTED. The Court's July 25, 2013 Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order, ECF No. 202, is VACATED. A Second Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order is forthcoming.<sup>3</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 29, 2014

20

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR CHIEF JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Requesting Parties state that "[i]f the Court is willing to grant the requested extension, the Requesting Parties have agreed to voluntarily postpone substantial discovery activities until after [additional] mediation, allowing the parties to focus their time, efforts and limited resources on settlement." ECF No. 257.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> All parties who have appeared in this action with the exception of Arrowood joined the stipulation and request. See ECF Nos. 255 at 4 n.1; 257 at 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The new fact discovery cut-off in this matter is September 25, 2014. The Final Pretrial Conference will be held on May 28, 2015 and the Jury Trial is set for July 20, 2015. The Second Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order will contain all of the new deadlines and dates for this matter.