(PC) Moncrief v	California Department of Corrections and Rehabiliation, et al

1	Kenneth N. Frucht (SBN 178881)				
2	Frederick J. Geonetta (SBN 114824) GEONETTA & FRUCHT, LLP				
3	100 Montgomery Street, Suite 1600 San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 433-4589				
4					
5	Fax: (415) 392-7973				
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff John Philip Moncrief				
7					
8					
9					
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
11	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12					
13	JOHN PHILIP MONCRIEF,) CASE NO.: 2:12-cv-00414 MCE AC P			
14	Plaintiff,)			
15	v.)			
16	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF	 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED ORDER] FOR EXTENSION OF TIME 			
17	CORRECTIONS & REHABILITATION, RANDY GROUNDS, GARY) TO FILE A MOTION TO AMEND AND) TO AMEND COMPLAINT (L. Rule 144; 			
18	SWARTHOUT, and DOES 1-50, inclusive,) FRCP 6)			
19	Defendants.)			
20					
21	STIPULATION				
22	On June 24, 2014 and August 21, 2014 respectively, the parties filed Stipulations and				
23	Proposed Orders to extend the time for Plaintiff to file an amended complaint (Docket Nos.				
24	49, 51). The Court signed and entered the orders requested (Docket Nos. 50, 52), and the				
25	current extension expires on November 7, 2014. The purpose of these extensions was to				
26	allow Plaintiff to complete discovery into the names of Doe defendants. Since that time the				
	Defendants' counsel has been attempting, in response to Plaintiff's FRCP 30(b)(6) deposition				
27	notice, to identify the person(s) most knowledgeable about decisions that were made related				
28	to the housing of Plaintiff on the date he alle	eges he was injured. It took some time, but			

Defendants counsel identified two persons whose depositions were taken in Sacramento on 1 2 October 29, 2014. At the deposition Defendants' counsel identified one other person who it appears may have been the person who was responsible for processing Plaintiff during his 3 transfer on the day he was injured. Additionally, one of the deponents identified a document 4 that, if it still exists, is likely to shed further light on what happened on the date of Plaintiff's 5 injury. Plaintiff would therefore like to take the deposition of the other person identified, and 6 if possible obtain the document that was identified by the previous deponent, before moving 7 to amend. To do so requires a final extension of time. 8

Therefore, pursuant to Civil Local Rules 144, and FRCP 6, Plaintiff John Moncrief, by and through his attorney of record, Kenneth Frucht of the Geonetta & Frucht, LLP law firm, and Defendants Grounds, Swarthout, and CDRC, by and through their attorney of record Kelli M. Hammond, hereby stipulate that the time for Plaintiff to file a motion to amend and to file an amended complaint be extended from November 7, 2014 to January 15, 2014. The purpose of the extension is to allow Plaintiff to take sufficient discovery to be able to identify Doe defendants so that he can file an amended complaint substituting in the named defendants for the individual defendants.

SO STIPULATED.

EASTERN DISTRICT COURT, CASE NO. 12-0414

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20	Dated: November 12, 14		GEONETTA & FRUCHT, LLP
21		By:	/s/ Kenneth Frucht
22		-	KENNETH FRUCHT Attorneys for Plaintiff
23			Auomeys for Flammin
24			
25	Dete de Nersensken 12, 14		
26	Dated: November 12, 14		ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA
27		By:	/s/ Kelli M. Hammond
28			KELLI M. HAMMOND Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants
	STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO AMEND MONCRIEF v. CDCR		

1	IT IS SO ORDERED
2	
3	
4	
5	Dated: November 12, 2014
6	Dated: November 12, 2014 <u>Allison Clane</u> ALLISON CLAIRE
7	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26	
27	
28	
	STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO AMEND MONCRIEF v. CDCR EASTERN DISTRICT COURT, CASE NO. 12-0414