STIPULATION RE AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEDULING ORDER - CASE NO. 2:15-CV-00799 KJM-DB

Terry et al v. Wasatch Advantage Group, LLC et al

Doc. 111

1	Andrew Wolff (SBN 195092)
2	andrew@awolfflaw.com Tony Ruch (SBN 242717) LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW WOLFF, PC
3	1615 Broadway, 4th Floor
4	Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 834-3300; (510) 834-3377 (Fax)
5	Jesse Newmark (SBN 247488)
6	jessenewmark@centrolegal.org Micaela Alvarez (SBN 319908)
7	malvarez@centrolegal.org CENTRO LEGAL DE LA RAZA 3022 International Blvd., Suite 410
8	Oakland, CA 94601 (510) 437-1863; (510) 437-9164
9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Relators
10	Attorneys for Framitins and Relators
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Plaintiffs and Relators Denika Terry, Roy Huskey III, and Tamera Livingston and Defendants Wasatch Advantage Group, LLC, Wasatch Property Management, Inc., Wasatch Pool Holdings, LLC, Chesapeake Commons Holdings, LLC, Logan Park Apartments, LLC, and Logan Park Apartments, LP (together, "the Parties"), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, the Court issued the most recent pretrial scheduling order in this case on December 21, 2018 (ECF 103);

WHEREAS, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), the Court has broad discretion to modify a pretrial scheduling order on a showing of "good cause," focusing on the diligence of the parties and the reasons for the requested modification, *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992); *C.F. ex rel. Farnan v. Capistrano Unified Sch. Dist.*, 654 F.3d 975, 984 (9th Cir. 2011);

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs sought amendments to the pretrial scheduling order by motion filed on June 14, 2019 (ECF 107 at 15-19), and Defendants indicated that they agreed to Plaintiffs' proposed amendments (ECF 107-1, Ex. 13; ECF 108 at 2);

WHEREAS, for the reasons set out in Plaintiffs' motion, Plaintiffs have shown good cause for relief from the scheduling order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) (*see* ECF 107 at 15-19 (describing Plaintiffs' diligence, delays to the litigation resulting from the Parties' dispute about the class list, the addition of new counsel, and the Parties' exploration of mediation));

WHEREAS, the amended deadlines proposed by Plaintiffs in their June 14th motion were calculated to address the delays to the litigation resulting from the Parties' months-long dispute regarding the class list, which has unavoidably and significantly delayed both notice to the class and merits discovery efforts (ECF 107 at 17, 18-19);

WHEREAS, the remainder of Plaintiffs' June 14th motion addressed issues relating to the class list and class notice, seeking clarification or amendment of the class period for the Reimbursement Class, an order requiring Defendants to compile and produce the class list no later than July 26, 2019, and approval of Plaintiffs' proposed class notice (ECF 107 at 9-15);

WHEREAS, on July 2, 2019, the Court vacated the July 12, 2019 hearing on Plaintiffs' motion and reset the hearing for August 23, 2019 (ECF 109);

WHEREAS, the new hearing date will further push back the class notice, which depends on the Court resolving the present dispute between the Parties regarding the scope and membership of the Reimbursement Class certified pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23 and Defendants thereafter producing a class list in compliance with the Court's order;

WHEREAS, the Parties agree that the pretrial scheduling order should be amended to account for these unavoidable delays;

WHEREAS, the Parties seek an order from the Court relieving them of the current fact discovery cut-off of September 20, 2019, as that deadline "cannot be reasonably met" despite the Parties' diligence, for the reasons set out in Plaintiffs' motion (see Fed. R. Civ. P. 16, advisory committee's notes (1983 amendment) (quoted in *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609));

WHEREAS, the Parties agree that the following modifications to the Court's scheduling order entered on December 21, 2018 (ECF 103) would be appropriate:

- Fact discovery shall be completed by **38 weeks** following the entry of the Court's order regarding Plaintiffs' Motion Seeking (1) Clarification, or in the Alternative, Amendment of the Class Definition; (2) Compilation of the Class List; and (3) Approval of Proposed Class Notice;
- Expert witness disclosures shall be made no later than 4 weeks following the close of fact discovery;
- Rebuttal expert witness disclosures shall be made no later than 7 weeks following the close of fact discovery;
- All expert discovery shall be completed no later than 12 weeks following the close of fact discovery;
- All dispositive motions, except motions for continuances, temporary restraining orders or other emergency applications, shall be **filed** no later than **16 weeks** following the close of fact discovery.

THEREFORE, the Parties jointly stipulate and request that the Court so order.

24

25

26

1	Dated:	Respectfully submitted,
2		GOLDSTEIN, BORGEN, DARDARIAN & HO
3		
4		/s/ Anne P. Bellows Anne P. Bellows
5		Attorneys for Plaintiff and Relators
6	Dated:	Respectfully submitted,
7		LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
8		/a/ Program Matth awa (as outhorized on July 0, 2010)
9		/s/ Ryan Matthews (as authorized on July 9, 2019) Ryan Matthews
10		Attorneys for Defendants
11		
12		
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
14	DATED: July 10, 2019.	MA MILO /
15		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16		
17		
18		
19		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		