MAYALL HURLEY, P.C.	
A Professional Corporation	
2453 Grand Canal Boulevard, Second Floor Stockton, California 95207-8253	
Telephone (209) 477-3833	
MARK E. BERRY, ESQ. CA State Bar No. 155091	
DERICK KONZ, ESQ	
CA State Bar No. 286902	
Attorneys for Defendants,	
COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN and	
MANUEL ANDRADE	
THE LAW OFFICE OF YOUSEF J. TOTA	Н
YOUSEF J. TOTAH, ESQ. (SBN: 296759)	
951 Mariners Island Blvd., Suite 300 San Mateo, California 94404	
Telephone: (650) 378-1290	
Facsimile: (650) 378-1291	
E-mail: y.totah@yousefjtotahlaw.com	
Attorney for Plaintiff,	
JONATHAN EARL DANNER	
UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DI	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
) Case No - 2:15 at 00997 MCE FED
JONATHAN EARL DANNER,) Case No.: 2:15-cv-00887-MCE-EFB
Plaintiff,) JOINT OBJECTION TO THE INITIAL
,) PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER;
vs.	 STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER FOR MODIFICATION OF THE INITIAL
THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN, and	PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER.
MANUEL ANDRADE,)
Defendants.	
	,)
Pursuant to Fed Rules Civ Procerule	e 16(b)(4), by stipulation of all parties, and good
cause showing therefor, Defendants COUNTY	OF SAN JOAQUIN and MANUEL ANDRADE
Joint Objection To The Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order; Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order.	Stipulation And Proposed Order For Modification Of The
Page 1	Dockets Justia

1	(collectively hereinafter "Defendants") and Plaintiff JONATHAN DANNER hereby move this
2	Court to modify the Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order. (ECF No. 24.)
3	I. <u>PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND</u>
ł	On April 24, 2015, Plaintiff filed his original Complaint in this matter. (ECF No. 1.)
5	On August 18, 2015, Defendants COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN and MANUEL
	ANDRADE filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to Fed. Rules Civ. Proc., rule
	<u>12(b)(6)</u> . (ECF No. 13.)
	On December 2, 2015, the court GRANTED in part and DENIED in part Defendants'
	motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 18.)
	On December 21, 2015, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 19.)
	On January 11, 2016, Defendants filed Answers to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint.
	(ECF Nos. 20, 21.)
	On May 4, 2016, the Court issued a Pretrial Scheduling Order. (ECF No. 24.) The
	Pretrial Scheduling Order required, "[a]ll discovery, with the exception of expert discovery,
	shall be completed no later than three hundred sixty-five (365) days from the filing of the
	original complaint in the action." (ECF No. 24, 2:18-20.)
	II. <u>STIPULATION AND STATEMENT OF GOOD CAUSE</u>
	Coord course switter to me diffy the Dretrical Scheduling Order
	Good cause exists to modify the Pretrial Scheduling Order.
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already passed when the court issued the May 4, 2016 Pretrial Scheduling Order. Neither party has
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already passed when the court issued the May 4, 2016 Pretrial Scheduling Order. Neither party has conducted discovery yet.
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already passed when the court issued the May 4, 2016 Pretrial Scheduling Order. Neither party has conducted discovery yet. The parties hereby stipulate and request that the Court modify the Pretrial Scheduling
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already passed when the court issued the May 4, 2016 Pretrial Scheduling Order. Neither party has conducted discovery yet. The parties hereby stipulate and request that the Court modify the Pretrial Scheduling Order such that the non-expert discovery cut-off date be set to three hundred sixty-five (365)
	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already passed when the court issued the May 4, 2016 Pretrial Scheduling Order. Neither party has conducted discovery yet. The parties hereby stipulate and request that the Court modify the Pretrial Scheduling Order such that the non-expert discovery cut-off date be set to three hundred sixty-five (365) days from the December 21, 2015 filing of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Accordingly,
) 2 3 4 5 7	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already passed when the court issued the May 4, 2016 Pretrial Scheduling Order. Neither party has conducted discovery yet. The parties hereby stipulate and request that the Court modify the Pretrial Scheduling Order such that the non-expert discovery cut-off date be set to three hundred sixty-five (365) days from the December 21, 2015 filing of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Accordingly,
9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	As the scheduling order currently directs, discovery is to be completed by April 24, 2016 ("365 days from the filing of the original complaint"). This date has already passed and already passed when the court issued the May 4, 2016 Pretrial Scheduling Order. Neither party has conducted discovery yet. The parties hereby stipulate and request that the Court modify the Pretrial Scheduling Order such that the non-expert discovery cut-off date be set to three hundred sixty-five (365) days from the December 21, 2015 filing of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Accordingly,

timelines in the Court's Pretrial Scheduling Order would remain the same, as they a	
conditioned on occurring within a set number of days after the non-expert discovery cut-off date	
Defendants and Plaintiff, by and through their attorneys of record, hereby stipulate at	
agree to the foregoing modification	ation of the Scheduling Order.
DATED: May 13, 2016	MAYALL HURLEY, P.C.
	/s/ Mark E. Berry By
	MARK E. BERRY, Esq. Attorney for Defendants, COUNT OF SAN JOAQUIN and MANUEL ANDRADE
DATED: May 13, 2016	THE LAW OFFICE OF YOUSEF J. TOTAH
	/s/ Yousef J. Totah (as authorized on 5/13/16)
	By YOUSEF J. TOTAH, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff, JONATHAN DANNER
	<u>ORDER</u>
By stipulation of the pa	arties and good cause appearing therefor, the Court hereby Ord
that the Pretrial Scheduling Or	der (ECF No. 24) is modified as follows:
All discovery in this	s action, with the exception of expert discovery, shall
completed no later than Dec	ember 21, 2016. The previous date of April 24, 2016 is here
vacated.	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
Dated: May 16, 2016	MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE