

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAMONT CROSSLEY,
Plaintiff,
v.
ABE NIAZI, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:12-cv-2180 TLN CKD P

ORDER

At a June 8, 2016 hearing on plaintiff’s motion to modify the further scheduling order (ECF Nos. 85, 89 & 90), attorneys Rachel Muoio, Stephanie Albrecht, and Michael Wood appeared for plaintiff, and attorney James Walter appeared for defendants. Having considered the record and arguments, and good cause appearing, the court makes the following order:

1. Plaintiff’s motion to modify the further scheduling order to reopen discovery on a limited basis (ECF No. 85) is granted as set forth below.
2. The current scheduling order (ECF No. 61) is vacated and discovery is reopened for a period of ninety (90) days from the date this order is electronically docketed.
3. During this period, plaintiff may conduct further discovery in this matter, limited to:
 - a. Depositions of parties and non-parties;
 - b. Service of subpoenas on non-parties;


///

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

- c. Service of up to 25 additional interrogatories on defendants Niazi and Galloway;
- d. Service of requests for admission on defendants Niazi and Galloway as to “the genuineness of any described documents” (FRCP 36(a)(1)(B)); and
- e. Service of up to 25 additional requests for admissions on defendants Niazi and Galloway as to “facts, the application of law to fact, or opinions about either” (FRCP 36(a)(1)(A)).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 14, 2016



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2 / cros2180.disc