II			
1 2	BRITTANY RUPLEY HAEFELE (Bar No. 276208) WILLIAM L. PORTER (Bar No. 133968) PORTER LAW GROUP, INC.		
2	7801 Folsom Boulevard, Suite 101 Sacramento, California 95826		
-	Telephone: (916) 381-7868 Facsimile: (916) 381-7880		
4 5	Email: <u>bporter@porterlaw.com</u> Email: bhaefele@porterlaw.com		
6	Attorneys for Defendant NEW PARADIGM PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, LLC		
7	RONALD W. HOPKINS (Bar No. 100895) CHRISTIAN J. GASCOU (Bar No. 209957) GASCOU HOPKINS LLP 9696 Culver Boulevard, Suite 302 Culver City, California 90232 Telephone: (310) 785-9116 Facsimile: (310) 785-9149		
8			
9			
10			
11	Email: <u>rhopkins@gascouhopkins.com</u> Email: cgascou@gascouhopkins.com		
12			
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SACRAMENTO DIVISION		
16	ALLIED WORLD INSURANCE COMPANY,		
	a Delaware corporation,	Case No. 2:16-CV-02992-MCE-GGH	
17	Plaintiff,	Ex Parte Motion for Request to Modify	
18	V.	Pretrial Order By Stipulation to Extend Fact Discovery By An Additional Forty-Five Days	
19 20	NEW PARADIGM PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, LLC, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,		
21	Defendants.		
22	Derendants.	Case No. 2:17-cv-00552-KJM-CKD	
23	NEW PARADIGM PROPERTY	(Administratively and consolidated with case	
24	MANAGEMENT, LLC, a California Corporation,	2:16-CV-02992-MCE-GGH)	
25	Plaintiff,		
26	v.		
20	ALLIED WORLD INSURANCE COMPANY,		
	a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 200, inclusive		
28	Defendants.		
		1 -	
	STIPULATED REQUEST TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL ORDER		

1	Pursuant to Local Rule 143 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 16(b)(4),				
2	Defendant, NEW PARADIGM PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, LLC (hereinafter Defendant),				
3	and Plaintiff, ALLIED WORLD INSURANCE COMPANY (hereinafter Plaintiff) by and				
4 5	through the undersigned counsel, hereby jointly stipulate and request this Court to issue an Order				
6	to modify the Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order (ECF No. 3) (hereinafter "Initial Pretrial				
7	cheduling Order" or "Pretrial Order") for case 2:16-CV-02992-MCE-GGH, by extending the				
8	dates for conclusion of fact discovery by an additional forty-five days from the current fact				
9	discovery deadline of June 19, 2018—to August 3, 2018, with all other deadlines to remain as				
10	deadlines to remain as governed by the Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order.				
11	The Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order allocated 365 days for fact discovery until				
12 13	December 22, 2017 (ECF No. 3). Discovery including initial Rule 26(f) disclosures was then				
13 14	placed on hold pending ruling on Defendant's Motion to Compel Arbitration (ECF No. 23),				
15	which was denied on September 28, 2017. Shortly after denial of the motion on October 16,				
16	2017, the court granted a joint request to extend fact discovery by 120 days to April 20, 2018				
17	(ECF No. 28) and by 60 days to June 19, 2018 (ECF No. 31). However, even with these				
18	modifications, the total time period for fact discovery on this complex construction dispute has				
19	been slightly less than 9 months, in place of the original 365 days allocated to discovery.				
20 21	The parties have to date since October diligently engaged in discovery consisting of				
21 22	the exchange of several rounds of very lengthy written discovery, including amended and				
23	supplemental responses after meet and confers, and the exchange of several binders of				
24	documents concerning the construction project obtained both from the parties and from third				
25	parties through subpoena.				
26	The last of the responses to document production requests was accomplished in early				
27	March. Since that exchange and in April and May of 2018, the parties have exchanged additional				
28	lengthy rounds of written discovery and produced thousands of pages of additional documents				
	- 2 - STIPULATED REQUEST TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL ORDER				
1	" JIITULAIED NEQUESI IV WODIFY INE FKEIKIAL UKDEK				

## STIPULATED REQUEST TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL ORDER

1	pursuant to follow-up requests. Following the exchange of the extensive written discovery, the				
2	parties have now identified numerous witnesses for deposition—including party-affiliated PMQ				
3	witnesses and other non-party witnesses. After conferring on deposition scheduling, the parties				
4 5	recognize that it will be extremely difficult to schedule and conclude all of the necessary PMQ				
6	and third party witness depositions by June 19, 2018-which include former employees of the				
7	parties—plus any attendant discovery that may be required as a result of the depositions. In				
8	particular, the availability of one party's PMQ witness has been limited due to his appearance as				
9	a party representative at a lengthy arbitration, and their availability of the other party's PMQ has				
10	been limited because he will be out of the country until after the current discovery cut-off. The				
11	parties respectfully submit that they have been dutiful in conducting extensive discovery to date				
12 13	during a compressed time period—and would greatly appreciate an additional forty-five day				
13	extension to conclude fact discovery in an orderly manner.				
15	FRCP 16(b)(4) allows a court to modify a scheduling order upon a showing of "good				
16	cause." According to the Ninth Circuit Court, the "good cause" standard required is primarily				
17	concerned with the diligence taken by the party seeking the extension. Johnson v. Mammoth				
18	Recreations, Inc, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). A court may modify the scheduling order				
19	should the given deadlines not be reasonably able to be met, despite diligent efforts. Jackson v.				
20 21	Laureate, Inc., 186 F.R.D. 605, 608 (E.D. CA 1999) issues its.				
21	This Stipulated Request to Modify the Pretrial Order is supported by good cause.				
23	The parties hereby respectfully request that this Court modify the Pretrial Order by extending the				
24	fact discovery deadline by an additional forty-five days.				
25	This would result in the following new deadlines:				
26	Fact Discovery: August 3, 2018.				
27	All other deadlines in the Pretrial Order remain unchanged.				
28	//				
	- 3 - STIPULATED REQUEST TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL ORDER				
	STHULTED NEQUEST TO MODIFT THE I NETNAL ONDER				

1		GASCOU HOPKINS LLP
2	Dated: May 23, 2018	By:/Ronald Hopkins/
3		RONALD W. HOPKINS
4		Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant
5		
6		ALLIED WORLD INSURANCE COMPANY
7		
8	Dated: May 23, 2018	PORTER LAW GROUP, INC.
9		
10		
11		By: <u>/Brittany Rupley Haefe/</u>
12		
13		BRITTANY RUPLEY HAEFELE
14		Attorneys for Defendant/Counter-Claimant
15 16		NEW PARADIGM PROPERTY
10		
18		MANAGEMENT, LLC
19		
20		ORDER
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
22	Dated: June 7, 2018	
23		In Alter
24		MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR
25		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26		
27		
28		
		- 4 -
	STIPULATED REQUES	ST TO MODIFY THE PRETRIAL ORDER