1	-	
2		
3	3	
4	1	
5	5	
6	5	
7	7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	00000	
12	NO. 2.1	8-cv-00081-WBS-
13	3	
14		
15		
16	MOTION	RE: PLAINTIFFS' TO CONTINUE
17	Defendant. TRIALS	
18	3	
19		
20		
21	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	7-cv-01604-WBS-DB
22	ARIEL EPSTEIN POLLACK, an individual,	
23	Plaintiffs,	
24	l v.	
25	JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORPORATION,	
26	Defendant.	
27	7	
28	3	

Plaintiffs assert personal injury claims against

JetBlue arising out of an August 2016 turbulence incident on

JetBlue Airways Flight 429 from Boston Logan International

Airport to Sacramento International Airport. (Hill Compl. (Hill

Docket No. 1); Bohnel Compl. (Bohnel Docket No. 1).) Liability

discovery in Bohnel et al v. Jetblue Airways Corporation (2:18
cv-00081-WBS-DMC) has been consolidated with that in Hill, et al

v. Jetblue Airways Corporation (No. 2:17-cv-01604-WBS-DB). (See

Bohnel Docket No. 17; Hill Docket No. 26.) Both cases concern

the same August 2016 turbulence incident. Presently before the

court is plaintiffs' Motion to Continue Trial Date. (See Bohnel

Docket No. 24; Hill Docket No. 30.)

Plaintiffs ask this court to shift the trial dates and the discovery deadlines in <u>Hill</u> and <u>Bohnel</u> forward so that they may have time to conduct discovery before trial. Defendant does not object to the continuance of the trial dates in <u>Hill</u> and <u>Bohnel</u>. (See Response to Pl.'s Mot. to Continue Trial at 2

The National Transportation Safety Board is currently investigating the August 2016 turbulence incident that gave rise to plaintiffs' alleged injuries. (See Luke Decl. Ex 1 (Hill Docket No. 31-1).) As a result, JetBlue is subject to an investigative hold by the Board and JetBlue's ability to respond to plaintiffs' discovery requests is circumscribed by federal regulations. (See id.) Plaintiffs state that the investigative hold has hampered their ability to conduct discovery and placed the parties in a "holding pattern." (Mot. to Continue Trial Date at 5.)

Confusingly, JetBlue's Response to Plaintiff's Motion to Continue Trial Date indicates that it objects "to the consolidation of the damages trial portion of all four [p]laintiffs' cases." (See Response to Pl.'s Mot. to Continue Trial at 2 (Hill Docket No. 32; Bohnel Docket No. 26).) Given that plaintiffs are moving to continue the trial dates in Hill

(Bohnel Docket No. 26; Hill Docket No. 32).)

In light of plaintiffs' diligence in attempting to conduct discovery in a timely manner, the need for a continuance, the lack of objection to the continuance, and the potential prejudice to plaintiffs if their motion is denied, the court will grant plaintiffs' Motion to Continue Trial. (Bohnel Docket No. 24; Hill Docket No. 30.) See United States v. 2.61 Acres of Land, More or Less, Situated in Mariposa Cty., 791 F.2d 666, 671 (9th Cir. 1985) (discussing factors to be evaluated by courts considering motions to continue trial).

Accordingly, the court modifies the scheduling orders in Hill (Docket No. 26) and Bohnel (Docket No. 17) as follows:

Fact discovery completion	December 30, 2019.
Expert witness disclosure	June 8, 2020
Rebuttal witness disclosure	July 6, 2020
Discovery completion deadline	August 3, 2020
Dispositive motion deadline	September 14, 2020
Final pretrial conference	October 26, 2020 at 1:30 p.m.
Hill Trial	October 26, 2020 at 1:30 p.m. January 5, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion to Continue the Trial Date (Hill Docket No. 30; Bohnel Docket No. 24) is GRANTED and the dates and deadlines of the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order (Bohnel Docket No. 17; Hill Docket No. 26) are modified as described herein.

and Bohnel, and not to consolidate, the court will ignore JetBlue's objections to the consolidation of the trials on the damages issue.

3

25

27

28

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Dated: August 7, 2019

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE