

**THE MARKHAM LAW FIRM**

David R. Markham (SBN 071814)  
dmarkham@markham-law.com  
Maggie Realin (SBN 263639)  
mrealin@markham-law.com  
750 B Street, Suite 1950  
San Diego, California 92101  
Tel.: 619.399.3995; Fax: 619.615.2067

**THE RDM LEGAL GROUP**

Russel Myrick (SBN 270803)  
russel@rdmlg.com  
MANCHESTER FINANCIAL BUILDING  
7979 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 400  
La Jolla, California 92037  
Tel.: 888.482.8266 Fax: 858.244.7930

Attorneys for Plaintiff and all others similarly situated

**SCOPELITIS, GARVIN, LIGHT, HANSON & FEARY, LLP**

Christopher C. McNatt, Jr. (SBN 174559)  
cmcnatt@scopelitis.com  
2 North Lake Avenue, Suite 460  
Pasadena, California 91101  
Tel.: 626.795.4700; Fax: 858.795.4790

Andrew J. Butcher (pro hac vice)  
abutcher@scopelitis.com  
30 West Monroe Street, Suite 600  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Tel.: 312.255.7200; Fax: 202.296.9433

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

BILL BARKER, TAB BACHMAN, AND  
WILLIAM YINGLING, individually and on  
behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SWIFT TRANSPORTATION COMPANY OF  
ARIZONA, LLC, and DOES 1 - 10, Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:16-CV-01532-TLN-CKD

Hon. Troy L. Nunley

**STIPULATION AND ORDER THEREON TO  
AMEND SCHEDULING ORDER**

Complaint Filed: 1 April 2016

Removed: 5 July 2016

Discovery Cutoff: 1 June 2016

Expert Witness Disclosure: 27 July 2017

Class Certification: 21 September 2017

1 Plaintiffs Bill Barker, Tab Bachman, and William Yingling (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendant Swift  
2 Transportation Company Of Arizona, LLC, (“Swift”), by and through their respective attorneys of  
3 record, and pursuant to USDC EDCA Local Rules 143 and 144(d) and FRCP 16(b), hereby stipulate and  
4 agree as follows:

5 WHEREAS, on or about 6 September 2016, this Court, pursuant to the Federal Rule of Civil  
6 Procedure (“FRCP”) 16(b) and the FRCP 26(f) Conference Statement of the parties, issued a Scheduling  
7 Order setting the discovery cut-off for 1 June 2017;

8 WHEREAS, this is a complex case involving multiple claims, many potential fact witnesses and  
9 experts, and which requires each side to spend significant time identifying and analyzing a voluminous  
10 amount of driver logs, wage statements, and other electronic materials;

11 WHEREAS, since the issuance of the Pretrial Scheduling Order, the parties have worked  
12 diligently towards completing discovery;

13 WHEREAS, the parties stipulate and agree they are unable to complete discovery by the 1 June  
14 2017 cut-off date;

15 WHEREAS, the parties have acted with diligence in trying to adhere to the current pretrial  
16 deadlines but are making this request to the Court for modification of the current scheduling order  
17 because absent an extension, the parties will be unable to complete discovery;

18 WHEREAS, neither party will be prejudiced by a two-month continuance of the current  
19 discovery cutoff date; and

20 NOW THEREFORE, the parties, through their respective counsel, jointly propose and stipulate  
21 to the following:

22 The deadlines in the Pretrial Scheduling Order previously set forth by the Court shall be revised  
23 as follows, or set on such other dates as the Court determines:

24

Event	Current Date	Proposed New Date
Fact Discovery Cut-Off Date	1 June 2017	31 July 2017

25  
26  
27  
28



1 **ORDER**

2 FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, and pursuant to the Stipulation of the parties, the deadline in the  
3 Scheduling Order previously set forth by the Court are revised as follows:


4

Event	Current Date	Extended Date Per Amended Scheduling Order
Fact Discovery Cut-Off Date	1 June 2017	31 July 2017

5  
6  
7

8 IT IS SO ORDERED

9  
10 Dated: May 30, 2017

11  
12 

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  

---

Troy L. Nunley  
United States District Judge