

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

COPART, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPARTA CONSULTING, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-00046-KJM-CKD

ORDER

On August 17, 2016, the court issued an Amended Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order, which set a new case schedule and addressed other pretrial issues, including the scope of discovery on the new claims added in the Third Amended Complaint. Am. Status Order, ECF No. 140. On August 30, 2016, plaintiff/counter-defendant Copart, Inc. filed objections to the Order, requesting that the court continue most of the deadlines in the schedule, and requesting certain “clarifications” on the allowed scope of discovery. Pl.’s Objections, ECF No. 143. Copart also filed a request to seal Exhibits D, E, F, G, H, and I to the declaration of Jason S. Takenouchi submitted in support of the objections. Req. Seal, ECF No. 144. Defendants/counter-plaintiffs responded to Copart’s objections and opposed Copart’s sealing request. Defs.’ Resp. Objections, ECF No. 147. Copart replied. Pl.’s Reply, ECF No. 148.

1 Having considered the parties' filings, the court finds Copart has not shown good
2 cause for the requested modifications to the schedule, especially in light of the recent
3 developments in discovery. *See* Discovery Order, Aug. 31, 2016, ECF No. 146; Llewellyn Decl.
4 ¶ 4 & Ex. B. Copart's objections are OVERRULED and the Amended Status Order is now final.
5 Any remaining and future discovery disputes shall be resolved by the magistrate judge as
6 provided by Local Rule 302(c)(1).

7 In addition, the court DECLINES to "clarify" the issues raised by the objections.
8 The court's Amended Status Order speaks for itself.

9 Finally, although Copart has provided more support than in the past, the court
10 finds Copart still has not made a "particularized showing of 'good cause'" for its request for
11 blanket sealing. *See Zurich Am. Ins. Co. v. ACE Am. Ins. Co.*, No. 11-0881, 2012 WL 3638467,
12 at *2 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2012); *see also Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172,
13 1180 (9th Cir. 2006). Accordingly, the court DENIES Copart's sealing request. *See Nixon v.*
14 *Warner Commc'ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 (1978). Defendants are directed to publicly file their
15 opposition to the sealing request on the docket.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 DATED: September 20, 2016

18
19
20 
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE