

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  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

B.O.L.T., an unincorporated association of motorcycle riders and enthusiasts; MARK TEMPLE, an individual; NOREEN MCNULTY, an individual; WARREN PEARL, an individual; LYLE DUVAUCHELLE, an individual; GLENN OSBORN, an individual; JEFFREY RABE, an individual; DAVID ZALITSKIY, an individual; WILLIAM LANGHORNE, an individual; THOMAS BELL, an individual; ROBERT BALTHORPE II, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA, a political subdivision of the state of California; COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, a political subdivision of the state of California; RANCHO CORDOVA POLICE DEPARTMENT, an independent legal agency of the COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO and the CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA; SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; MICHAEL GOOLD, in his official capacity as the Chief of Police of the CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA; RANCHO CORDOVA POLICE TRAFFIC SERGEANT G. LANE, in his

No. 2:14-cv-01588-GEB-DAD

**ORDER CONTINUING STATUS  
(PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE**

1 individual and official  
2 capacity as Supervisor of the  
3 Traffic Division; SCOTT R.  
4 JONES, in his official  
5 capacity as the SHERIFF of  
6 the COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO;  
7 RANCHO CORDOVA POLICE OFFICER  
8 S. CARRDOZZO (badge number  
9 480); RANCHO CORDOVA POLICE  
10 OFFICER M. JAMES (badge  
11 number 507); RANCHO CORDOVA  
12 POLICE OFFICER S. PADGETT  
13 (badge number 1174),

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Defendants.

9  
10 Plaintiffs state in the Joint Status Report ("JSR")  
11 filed October 14, 2014, that they "anticipate filing an Amended  
12 and Supplemental Complaint." (JSR 3:4, ECF No. 18.) This  
13 statement fails to comply with Plaintiffs' obligation under Rule  
14 16 to provide meaningful information on when the referenced  
15 amendment would be sought.

16 Parties anticipating possible  
17 amendments . . . have an unflagging  
18 obligation to alert the Rule 16 scheduling  
19 judge of the . . . timing of such anticipated  
20 amendments in their status reports so that  
21 the judge can consider whether such  
22 amendments may properly be sought solely  
23 under the Rule 15(a) standard, and whether  
24 structuring discovery pertinent to the  
25 parties' decision whether to amend is  
26 feasible.

27 Jackson v. Laureate, Inc., 186 F.R.D. 605, 608 (E.D. Cal. 1999)  
28 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Therefore, the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference  
scheduled for hearing on October 27, 2014, is continued to  
November 10, 2014, at 9:00 a.m. A further joint status report  
shall be filed no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the  
Status Conference, in which Plaintiff shall provide additional

1 information concerning the referenced amendment.


2 IT IS SO ORDERED.

3 Dated: October 16, 2014

4

5

6

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.  
Senior United States District Judge

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28