8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
MARIA DEL CARMEN PENA, et al.,	No. 2:13-CV-01282-KJM-AC
Plaintiffs,	
v.	ORDER
TAYLOR FARMS PACIFIC, INC., d/b/a TAYLOR FARMS, et al.,	
Defendants.	
Defendent Mennewer Inc. re	usets loave to conduct discovery Joint Status
17Defendant Manpower, Inc. requests leave to conduct discovery. Joint Status18Report at 1–5, ECF No. 150. As explained below, the court DENIES the request.	
At the status conference held March 20, 2014, the court granted the parties	
0 ["eight weeks from the date the court rule[d] on the latter of [co]defendant Taylor Farms Pacific,	
Inc.'s [then-]pending motion for summary judgment and defendant Manpower, Inc.'s	
22 [[then-]pending motion to dismiss" to file "any remaining dispositive motion against individual	
23 plaintiffs." Minute Order, ECF No. 143. The court also instructed the parties to meet and	
24 confer before seeking leave of court if they wished to conduct additional discovery. <i>Id.</i> The	
25 relevant orders issued on March 28, 2014, ECF No. 144, and April 23, 2014, ECF No. 146,	
26 respectively, resulting in a dispositive motion deadline of June 18, 2014. Defendant filed its	
27 request on June 12, 2014. <i>Id.</i> at 10.	
/////	
	FOR THE EASTERN I MARIA DEL CARMEN PENA, et al., Plaintiffs, v. TAYLOR FARMS PACIFIC, INC., d/b/a TAYLOR FARMS, et al., Defendants. Defendants. Defendants. Report at 1–5, ECF No. 150. As explained b At the status conference held i "eight weeks from the date the court rule[d] o Inc.'s [then-]pending motion for summary ju [then-]pending motion to dismiss" to file "an plaintiffs." Minute Order, ECF No. 143. Th confer before seeking leave of court if they v relevant orders issued on March 28, 2014, E0 respectively, resulting in a dispositive motion request on June 12, 2014. <i>Id.</i> at 10.

Despite nearly three months' time between the status conference and the deadline, defendant's request was not filed until six days before the deadline. Further, defendant made no attempt to either file a timely, but incomplete, motion or obtain relief from the deadline. Accordingly, and in light of the time afforded a party responding to a discovery request under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court finds that this eleventh-hour request could not have produced usable information. Accordingly, the request is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 7, 2014.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE