Varfolomeeva v. United States of America

Doc. 7

# 

# 

## 

## STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), Local Rule 240(b), and the Court's Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order (ECF No. 3), the parties have met and conferred regarding the nature and basis of their claims and defenses; the possibility of promptly settling or resolving this case; the disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1); preserving discoverable information; and developing a proposed discovery plan. Having so met and conferred,

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between the parties and subject to Court approval, that the Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order be modified as set forth below:

Deadline to serve initial disclosures	June 26, 2017
Deadline to complete fact discovery	December 18, 2017
Deadline for Plaintiff's initial expert disclosures	January 29, 2018
Deadline for Defendant's initial expert disclosures	March 26, 2018
Deadline for supplemental (i.e., rebuttal) expert disclosures	May 28, 2018
Deadline to complete expert discovery	July 30, 2018
Deadline for filing dispositive motions	September 17, 2018

The parties believe most of the discovery in this case will concern the disclosure and examination of opinions held by medical and other expert witnesses. Accordingly, the parties propose modifying the Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order to allocate more time to expert discovery than fact discovery. In compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f)(3), the parties provide the following additional information for the Court's consideration.

## I. Brief Case Summary

This case arises from a motor vehicle accident involving a pedestrian. On November 19, 2014, Plaintiff Alina Varfolomeeva alleges she was in a crosswalk at the intersection of J Street and Fifth Street in Sacramento, California, when a vehicle operated by a federal employee struck her in violation of California Vehicle Code section 21950(a). Plaintiff further alleges that the collision caused her personal injuries and other economic and noneconomic damages. Plaintiff maintains this action against the United States of America pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671–80,

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

which provides the exclusive remedy for personal injuries arising from the alleged negligent acts or omissions of federal employees acting within the scope of their employment. *Id.* § 2679(b)(1).

#### II. Compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f)(3)

## Disclosures Pursuant to Rule 26(a)

The parties will serve initial disclosures no later than June 26, 2017. The parties propose that Plaintiff shall serve her initial expert disclosures no later than January 29, 2018, and Defendant shall serve its initial expert disclosures no later than March 26, 2018. The parties propose that any supplemental (i.e., rebuttal) expert disclosures be served no later than May 28, 2018.

#### В. Subjects and Timing of Discovery

The parties believe the subjects of discovery will include the nature, location, and timing of Plaintiff's actions and those of the alleged tortfeasor on November 19, 2014, and the nature and extent of the personal injuries and other economic and noneconomic damages that Plaintiff alleges resulted from the incident. The parties propose that discovery occur in two phases—fact discovery and expert discovery—as outlined above. The parties propose a deadline of December 18, 2017, to complete fact discovery, and a deadline of July 30, 2018, to complete expert discovery.

## C. **Electronically Stored Information**

The parties do not anticipate discovery of electronically stored information.

### Protection of Privileges or Trial-Preparation Materials D.

The parties hereby agree that the scope of discovery shall not include documents prepared by counsel on or after November 19, 2014, or confidential attorney-client communications occurring on or after November 19, 2014, and that such documents or information shall be deemed non-responsive and may be withheld without the need to assert or interpose an objection or seek a protective order, except as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(4)(C) for certain communications with or documents provided to testifying experts. The parties further agree that privilege logs need not be produced unless and until requested by counsel in connection with specific objections that have been asserted.

### E. Changes in Discovery Limitations

The parties do not propose any changes in the limitations imposed on discovery by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court's Local Rules.

1	F. Other Orders Con-	cerning Di	iscovery	
2	The parties do not propose any other orders concerning discovery.			
3	Dated: May 15, 2017		TARASENKO LAW OFFICE	
4 5		By:	/s/ Kirill B. Tarasenko (authorized on 5/15/2017) KIRILL B. TARASENKO, ESQ.	
6			Attorney for Plaintiff ALINA VARFOLOMEEVA	
7				
8	Dated: May 22, 2017		PHILLIP A. TALBERT United States Attorney	
10		By:	/s/ Joseph B. Frueh JOSEPH B. FRUEH Assistant United States Attorney	
11				
12			Attorneys for Defendant UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
13				
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
15 16	Dated: May 24, 2017		1/m ASS	
17			MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				