

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

SCOTT EMERSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
F. FOULK, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-0972 TLN CKD P

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion seeking “an extension of time and/or new due dates” in this action. (ECF No. 28.) Plaintiff does not specify which deadline(s) in the Scheduling Order he seeks to have extended, or for how long. (See ECF No. 25.) Thus the court will deny this motion without prejudice to renewal.


Plaintiff also requests the appointment of a private medical expert to evaluate him. (ECF No. 29.) Pursuant to Rule 702 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, “[i]f scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise.” Fed. R. Evid. 702. Under Rule 706, the Court may on its own motion, or on the motion of a party appoint an expert witness. Fed. R. Evid. 706(a). However, the court finds that appointment of an expert is not necessary or appropriate at this time.

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 28) is denied without prejudice to renewal; and
2. Plaintiff's application for expert opinion (ECF No. 29) is denied.

Dated: June 24, 2015



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2 / emer0972.36