JOHN D. FEENEY, ESQ. (SBN 84373)		
Law Department		
Roseville, CA 95747 General: (916) 789-6400 Direct: (916) 789-6231		
Attorneys for Defendant		
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY		
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
KATIE M. STEFFEN,	Case No. 2:15-CV-01025-TLN-KJN	
Plaintiff,	STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER AND EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINES; ORDER	
vs.		
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, a		
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	e,	
Defendants.		
STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL		
SCHEDULING ORDER AND EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINES		
Pursuant to Rules 16(b) (4) and 29 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,		
Defendants UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY and BRIAN L. KLINE and		
Plaintiff KATIE M. STEFFEN, by and through their attorneys of record, subject to		
the approval of the Court and good cause present, hereby stipulate to modify the		
Pretrial Scheduling Order dated July 22, 2015, and extend the time for discovery		
deadlines previously set in this matter.		
///		
///		
STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER AND EXTEND		
DISCOVERY DEA	DLINES; ORDER	
	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY Law Department 10031 Foothills Boulevard, Suite 200 Roseville, CA 95747 General: (916) 789-6400 Direct: (916) 789-6231 Facsimile: (916) 789-6227 E-Mail: jdfeeney@up.com Attorneys for Defendant UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY IN THE UNITED STAT FOR THE EASTERN DIS KATIE M. STEFFEN, Plaintiff, vs. UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, a Delaware Corporation, BRIAN L. KLINE and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants. STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES SCHEDULING ORDER AND EXT Pursuant to Rules 16(b) (4) and 29 Defendants UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD Plaintiff KATIE M. STEFFEN, by and thro the approval of the Court and good cause Pretrial Scheduling Order dated July 22, deadlines previously set in this matter. ///	

The parties submit that there is good cause for the proposed modification of this Court's Pretrial Scheduling order for the following reasons: While this lawsuit revolves around a relatively simple set of facts – a two car collision on I-80 on September 3, 2015 – based upon a review of medical records subpoenaed to date, plaintiff is not currently medically stable and continues to treat with a variety of medical practitioners for myriad injuries, resulting primarily from a head injury (skull fracture). The parties understand that the basic diagnosis is traumatic brain injury, resulting in cognitive disabilities, including memory loss. While the defendants have been diligent in collecting medical records, depositions of the plaintiff and her treaters at this point are premature. Defendants have postponed the depositions for a time when when plaintiff has medically plateaued. While the parties' understanding is that the prognosis is guarded, both sides agree that additional time is warranted to make the depositions meaningful. Both sides desire to avoid duplicative depositions of treaters, as well as the plaintiff.

THEREFORE, THE PARTIES STIPULATE AND AGREE AND RESPECTFULLY REQUEST the following modifications to the scheduling order:

The date for completion of discovery, with the exception of expert discovery, is currently scheduled for June 30, 2016. The parties request an extension of this deadline to September 30, 2016.

The expert disclosure deadline is currently scheduled for August 25, 2016. The parties request an extension of this deadline to November 28, 2016.

The exchange of lists of rebuttal expert witnesses is currently scheduled for 20 days after August 26, 2016 – or September 14, 2016. The parties request an extension of this deadline to 20 days following the proposed new deadline of November 28, 2016 for expert disclosure- or December 15, 2016.

Counsel was 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. As a dispositive motion is not appropriate in this case, the parties request

1	an extension of the expert witness discovery completion date for 75 days after the		
2	rebuttal disclosure – or February 28, 2017.		
3	All other dates will remain the same as provided for in the July 22, 2015		
4	Pretrial Scheduling Order.		
5	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED.		
6			
7 8		OREYER BABICH BUCCOLA WOOD & CAMPORA, LLP	
9			
10	 Н	By: <u>/s/</u> ROBERT BUCCOLA	
11		State Bar No.112880 Attorneys for Plaintiff KATIE STEFFEN	
12			
13	Dated: <u>3/18/16</u> U	JNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY	
14			
15	I I	By: /s/ JOHN D. FEENEY	
16		State Bar No. 84373 Attorney for Defendant	
17		UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY	
18	IT IS SO ORDERED:		
19			
20	Dated: March 23, 2016	Thanking	
21		Troub Number	
22		Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge	
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		- 3 -	
	STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER AND EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINES; ORDER		