

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

JOHN MCCLINTOCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

COLOSIMO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-00264-TLN-DAD
**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’
AMENDED MOTION TO MODIFY
DISCOVERY & SCHEDULING ORDER**

Defendants Casillas and Merriweather have filed an amended motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order in this case. Specifically, defendants request a stay of discovery until after the court rules on their pending motion for summary judgment based upon plaintiff’s alleged failure to exhaust his administrative remedies prior to filing suit as required.

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendants Casillas and Merriweather’s motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order (Doc. No. 33) is denied as moot;
2. Defendants Casillas and Merriweather’s amended motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order (Doc. No. 34) is granted;


/////
/////

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

3. Discovery is stayed as to defendants Casillas and Merriweather. In the event that the court denies defendants' pending motion for summary judgment, the parties may serve discovery requests up to sixty days after the court's ruling; and

4. Except as stated in this order, the court's June 27, 2014, discovery and scheduling order remains in effect.

Dated: August 18, 2014



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

/mcc10264.41mod