

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

JOSEPH JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

E. SANDY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-02922 AC (P)

ORDER

Defendants Cruzen, Sandy, Lavagnino, Lavergne and Cobian have requested an additional twenty-five days, to and including January 7, 2014, within which to serve their responses to Plaintiff’s Request for Document Production, Set One. The Discovery and Scheduling Order (DSO) sets January 20, 2014 as the discovery deadline and requires that any motion to compel discovery be brought by that date. ECF No. 20. The court disagrees with the defendants’ contention that the requested extension would not prejudice plaintiff in light of the current discovery deadline. However, there is good cause to extend the deadlines set in the DSO. That scheduling order was issued after four of the defendants, Sandy, Lavagnino, Lavergne and Cobian, had answered the original complaint but before one of the defendants who seeks an extension, Cruzen, had filed an answer. In addition, plaintiff subsequently filed a first amended

1 complaint and the court, on November 25, 2013, found the first amended complaint appropriate
2 for service, as modified, upon six additional defendants. ECF No. 29.

3 In light of the foregoing, the court will VACATE the discovery and dispositive motion
4 deadlines set in the DSO (ECF No. 20), and will grant defendants' request for an extension of
5 time until January 7, 2014 (ECF No. 30) to respond to plaintiff's first set of requests for
6 production of documents. A new DSO will issue when all defendants have been served.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: December 12, 2013

9 
10 ALLISON CLAIRE
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28