

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

MARVIN GILLAM & PAMALA
GILLAM,

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

CITY OF VALLEJO, et al.,

 Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-2217-KJM-KJN PS

ORDER

Presently pending before the court is a motion to compel discovery responses, which has been noticed for hearing on February 12, 2016. (ECF No. 30.) However, plaintiffs’ motion fails to comply with the operative scheduling order, which requires discovery motions to be heard no later than January 14, 2016. (See ECF No. 23.) Although plaintiffs are proceeding without counsel,¹ and the court thus liberally construes their pleadings and filings, they are required to comply with the Local Rules, court orders, and case deadlines.

////


¹ To the extent that plaintiffs rely on their non-attorney “legal assistant,” Frederick Marc Cooley, to keep track of case deadlines and to advise them regarding compliance with the court’s orders, plaintiffs do so at their own peril. As the court has cautioned plaintiffs on numerous occasions, Mr. Cooley is not an attorney and is not allowed to represent them in federal court, and plaintiffs themselves are responsible for their compliance with the Local Rules, court orders, and case deadlines. (See, e.g., ECF Nos. 14, 23.)

1 Moreover, good cause does not exist to modify the scheduling order. The discovery
2 responses at issue were served on November 12, 2015, which provided plaintiffs with an adequate
3 opportunity to bring a timely motion to compel in accordance with the court's scheduling order.
4 Instead, plaintiffs first contacted defendants' counsel to schedule a meet-and-confer conference
5 on December 24, 2015, which, in addition to being Christmas Eve, was the last day on which a
6 notice of motion to compel could have been filed to ensure a timely hearing on January 14, 2016.
7 (See ECF No. 29; see also E.D. Cal. L.R. 251.)

8 In sum, the discovery motion hearing deadline has now passed, and no further discovery
9 motions will be entertained from any party. The parties are encouraged to focus their efforts on
10 preparing for any dispositive motions and/or trial.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion to compel (ECF No. 30) is
12 DENIED.

13 Dated: January 15, 2016

14 
15 _____
16 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28