

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MAHER SUAREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

CATE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-2048 KJM EFB (PC)
[PROPOSED] ORDER

Good cause appearing, Defendants’ motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order and vacate the previous scheduling order (ECF No. 93) is granted. A new discovery and scheduling order will be issued once a final determination on Defendants’ Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings is made, providing the Parties with 90 days to conduct discovery and 120 days to file any dispositive motions. Accordingly, defendants’ motion for a protective order (ECF No. 90) and request for an extension of time (ECF No. 91) are denied as moot.

Dated: June 2, 2016.


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE