XAVIER BECERRA, State Bar No. 118517 Attorney General of California PETER A. MESHOT, State Bar No. 117061 Supervising Deputy Attorney General DIANA ESQUIVEL, State Bar No. 202954 Deputy Attorney General 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7320 PERSIMIE: 916) 322-8288 E-mail: Diana Equivel@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants Osemwingle and Ramiscal IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, v. Plaintiff, v. STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO EXTEND EXPERT- RELATED DEADLINES BY FORTY- FIVE DAYS Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exist to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at 609 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 advisory committee's notes of 1983 amendment). "The district				
2 PETER Á. MISHIOT, State Bar No. 117061 Supervising Deputy Attorney General 1 DIANA ESQUIVEL, State Bar No. 202954 Deputy Attorney General 1 13001 Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7320 Fassimile: (916) 323-8288 E-mail: Diana Esquivel@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants Osemwingie and Ramiscal IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, v. Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Percentage of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	1	Attorney General of California PETER A. MESHOT, State Bar No. 117061		
DEADA ESQUIVEIL, State Bar No. 202954 Deputy Attorney General 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7320 Fassimile: (916) 322-8288 E-mail: Diana Esquivel@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants Osemwingie and Ramiscal IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, v. Bright Order To Extrend Extrem District of Order To Modify Scheduling ORDER TO Extrend Extrem DESTRICT ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO Extrend Extremal Extre	2			
4 1300 Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 94424-2550 5 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 6 Facsimile: (916) 322-8288 7 Attorneys for Defendants Osemwingie and Ramiscal 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SACRAMENTO DIVISION 11 12 WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, 13 V. Plaintiff, 14 V. Plaintiff, 15 OSEMWINGIE, et al., Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through 16 their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling 17 Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists 18 to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. 19 A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of 19 Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 10 Find the processing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In 10 Considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	3	DIANA ESQUIVEL, Štate Bar No. 202954 Deputy Attorney General 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7320 Facsimile: (916) 322-8288 E-mail: Diana.Esquivel@doj.ca.gov		
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 210-7320 Facsimile: (916) 322-8288 E-mail: Diana Esquivel@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants Osemwingie and Ramiscal IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, v. Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	4			
Facsimile: (916) 322-8288 E-mail: Diana.Esquivel@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants Osemwingie and Ramiscal IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, v. Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Defendants. Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	5			
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, V. STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER TO EXTEND EXPERT- RELATED DEADLINES BY FORTY- FIVE DAYS Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	6			
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO DIVISION WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, V. STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO EXTEND EXPERT- FIVE DAYS Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	7			
WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, V. OSEMWINGIE, et al., Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, v. OSEMWINGIE, et al., Plaintiff, Defendants. Plaintiff, V. OSEMWINGIE, et al., Plaintiff, Defendants. No. 2:16-cv-03008-JAM-CKD (PC) STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO EXTEND EXPERT- RELATED DEADLINES BY FORTY- FIVE DAYS Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
WILLIAM BARKER, Plaintiff, ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO EXTEND EXPERT- RELATED DEADLINES BY FORTY- FIVE DAYS Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	10	SACRAMENTO DIVISION		
No. 2:16-cv-03008-JAM-CKD (PC) Plaintiff, V. OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Defendants. Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Defendants. Defendants. Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	11			
Plaintiff, V. OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Defendants. Defendants. Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Defendants. Defendants. Plaintiff, OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Defendants. Defendants. Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	12	WILLIAM BARKER.	No. 2:16-cy-03008-IAM-CKD (PC)	
ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER TO EXTEND EXPERT- RELATED DEADLINES BY FORTY- FIVE DAYS Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	13	,	` '	
OSEMWINGIE, et al., Defendants. Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	14	,	ORDER TO MODIFY SCHEDULING	
Defendants. Trial Date: None Action Filed: April 12, 2017 Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	15	*•	RELATED DEADLINES BY FORTY-	
Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	16	OSEMWINGIE, et al.,		
Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	17	Defendants.		
their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	18			
Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	19	Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 143, the parties, through		
to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses. A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	20	their counsel of record, agree to and request a modification of the March 26, 2018 Scheduling		
A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	21	Order (ECF No. 53) to extend the expert-related deadlines by forty-five days. Good cause exists		
Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. Johnson, 975 F.2d at	22	to grant this stipulated request because the parties require more time to disclose expert witnesses.		
F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. <i>Johnson</i> , 975 F.2d at	23	A scheduling order may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and by leave of		
considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. <i>Johnson</i> , 975 F.2d at	24	Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), 16(b)(4); see, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975		
primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. <i>Johnson</i> , 975 F.2d at	25	F.2d 604, 609 (describing the factors a court should consider in ruling on such a motion). In		
	26	considering whether a party moving for a schedule modification has good cause, the Court		
28 609 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 advisory committee's notes of 1983 amendment). "The district	27	primarily focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the modification. <i>Johnson</i> , 975 F.2d at		
1	28			

[Proposed]-ORDER Good cause appearing, the parties' stipulated request to modify the expert-related deadlines is GRANTED. The March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order (ECF No. 53) is modified as follows: The deadline for disclosing experts is January 3, 2019, with any rebuttal experts witness disclosures due by January 31, 2019. Expert discovery shall close on March 1, 2019. Any discovery motions related to expert discovery must be noticed for the hearing to take place by this date and shall be brought in the same manner as motions related to non-expert discovery. In all other respects, the March 26, 2018 Scheduling Order remains in full force and effect. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 16, 2018 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE