1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	UTHE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, No. C 95-02377 WHA
11	Plaintiff,
12	v. ORDER DENYING MOTION
13	HARRY ALLEN and AETRIUM FOR EXTENSION OF EXPERT INCORPORT
14	INCORPORATED, Defendants.
15	/
16	Plaintiff moved on May 28 for an extension of the (now expired) May 31 deadline for
17	disclosure of opening expert reports. Plaintiff contends that its expert needs an extra two weeks
18 10	to adjust his expert opinion because plaintiff has been unable to find an alternate source of
19 20	information once stored in documents allegedly destroyed by defendants in 1992. Defendants
20 21	oppose, <i>inter alia</i> , on the ground that plaintiff cannot show good cause for an extension because
21	defendants completed their document production nearly six months ago. This order agrees that
22	good cause has not been shown under Rule 16 to modify the case management scheduling order.
24	Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for an extension is DENIED .
25	
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.
27	10 Ame
28	Dated: June 5, 2013. WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court For the Northern District of California