Sassman v. Brown et al Doc. 47

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM A. SASSMAN,

Plaintiff,

٧.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Governor of California, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-01679-MCE-KJN

PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER

The Court has reviewed the parties' submissions with regard to Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 35), which was still pending, in part, as to Plaintiff's request to further expedite the discovery and summary judgment schedule. That Motion is now DENIED in its entirety, and the Court makes the following Pretrial Scheduling Order.

I. DISCOVERY

All discovery, with the exception of expert discovery, shall be completed by **November 28, 2015.** In this context, "completed" means that all discovery shall have been conducted so that all depositions have been taken and any disputes relative to discovery shall have been resolved by appropriate order if necessary and, where discovery has been ordered, the order has been obeyed. All motions to compel

1
 2
 3

discovery must be noticed on the magistrate judge's calendar in accordance with the local rules of this Court.

II. DISCLOSURE OF EXPERT WITNESSES

All counsel are to designate in writing, file with the Court, and serve upon all other parties the name, address, and area of expertise of each expert that they propose to tender at trial not later than **December 31**, **2015**. The designation shall be accompanied by a written report prepared and signed by the witness. The report shall comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B).

Within twenty (20) days after the designation of expert witnesses, any party may designate a supplemental list of expert witnesses who will express an opinion on a subject covered by an expert designated by an adverse party. The right to designate a supplemental expert for rebuttal purposes only shall apply to a party who has not previously disclosed an expert witness on the date set for expert witness disclosure by this Pretrial Scheduling Order.

Failure of a party to comply with the disclosure schedule as set forth above in all likelihood will preclude that party from calling the expert witness at the time of trial. An expert witness not appearing on the designation will not be permitted to testify unless the party offering the witness demonstrates: (a) that the necessity for the witness could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time the list was proffered; (b) that the Court and opposing counsel were promptly notified upon discovery of the witness; and (c) that the witness was promptly made available for deposition.

For purposes of this Pretrial Scheduling Order, an "expert" is any person who may be used at trial to present evidence under Rules 702, 703, and 705 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, which include both "percipient experts" (persons who, because of their expertise, have rendered expert opinions in the normal course of their work duties or

¹ The discovery of experts will include whether any motions based on <u>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</u>, 509 U.S. 579 (1993) and/or <u>Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael</u>, 526 U.S. 137 (1999) are anticipated.

observations pertinent to the issues in the case) and "retained experts" (persons specifically designated by a party to be a testifying expert for the purposes of litigation).

Each party shall identify whether a disclosed expert is percipient, retained, or both. It will be assumed that a party designating a retained expert has acquired the express permission of the witness to be so listed. Parties designating percipient experts must state in the designation who is responsible for arranging the deposition of such persons.

All experts designated are to be fully prepared at the time of designation to render an informed opinion, and give their bases for their opinion, so that they will be able to give full and complete testimony at any deposition taken by the opposing party. Experts will not be permitted to testify at the trial as to any information gathered or evaluated, or opinion formed, after deposition taken subsequent to designation.

Counsel are instructed to complete all discovery of expert witnesses in a timely manner in order to comply with the Court's deadline for filing dispositive motions.

III. MOTION HEARING SCHEDULE

Motions for summary judgment shall be heard on **March 19, 2015.** All papers should be filed in conformity with the Local Rules. However, with respect to Motions for Summary Judgment only, the parties shall comply with the following filing deadlines:

Judgment	Filed not later than January 30, 2015
Opposition	Filed not later than February 20, 2015

Reply Filed not later than **March 5, 2015**

Absent leave of the Court, all issues the parties wish to resolve on summary judgment must be raised together in one (1) motion. Should the parties wish to file additional motions for summary judgment, they must seek leave of the Court.

All purely legal issues are to be resolved by timely pretrial motions. When appropriate, failure to comply with Local Rules 230 and 260, as modified by this Order, may be deemed consent to the motion and the Court may dispose of the motion

summarily. With respect to motions for summary judgment, failure to comply with Local Rules 230 and 260, as modified by this Order, may result in dismissal for failure to prosecute (or failure to defend) pursuant to this Court's inherent authority to control its docket and/or Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). Further, failure to timely oppose a summary judgment motion² may result in the granting of that motion if the movant shifts the burden to the nonmovant to demonstrate that a genuine issue of material fact remains for trial.

The Court places a page limit for points and authorities (exclusive of exhibits and other supporting documentation) of twenty (20) pages on all initial moving papers, twenty (20) pages on oppositions, and ten (10) pages for replies. All requests for page limit increases must be made in writing to the Court setting forth any and all reasons for any increase in page limit at least seven (7) days prior to the filing of the motion.

For the Court's convenience, citations to the Supreme Court Lexis database should include parallel citations to the Westlaw database.

The parties are reminded that a motion in limine is a pretrial procedural device designed to address the admissibility of evidence. The Court will look with disfavor upon dispositional motions presented at the Final Pretrial Conference or at trial in the guise of motions in limine.

The parties are cautioned that failure to raise a dispositive legal issue that could have been tendered to the court by proper pretrial motion prior to the dispositive motion cut-off date may constitute waiver of such issue.

IV. FURTHER PRETRIAL AND TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

If necessary, after the motion(s) for summary judgment have been decided, an amended pretrial scheduling order will issue setting, among other things, dates for the final pretrial conference and for trial.

///

² The Court urges any party that contemplates bringing a motion for summary judgment or who must oppose a motion for summary judgment to review Local Rule 260.

V. MODIFICATION OF PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER

The parties are reminded that pursuant to Rule 16(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Pretrial Scheduling Order shall not be modified except by leave of court upon a showing of **good cause**. Agreement by the parties pursuant to stipulation alone to modify the Pretrial Scheduling Order does not constitute good cause. Except in extraordinary circumstances, unavailability of witnesses or counsel will not constitute good cause.

VI. <u>OBJECTIONS TO PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER</u>

This Pretrial Scheduling Order will become final without further order of the Court unless objections are filed within seven (7) <u>court</u> days of service of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 20, 2014

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., CHIEF JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT