

1
2
3
4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 PRESTON D. MARSHALL,

No. C 10-1665 SI

8 Plaintiff,

ORDER RE: DISCOVERY SCHEDULE

9 v.

10 JOHN HUFFMAN IV, *et al.*,

11 Defendants.
12 _____/

13 Plaintiff has filed an administrative motion to extend by 90 days various discovery and filing
14 deadlines. Defendants object, contending that plaintiff did not meaningfully meet and confer prior to
15 filing the request, and that plaintiff's own conduct has caused any timing difficulties he faces.

16 The Court finds that plaintiff did not made adequate efforts to meet, confer or discuss with
17 defendants either his timing issues or his further discovery needs. On this basis, the Court will not grant
18 the requested 90 day extensions. The Court does order an approximately 30 day extension for discovery
19 cut-off and expert disclosures, as follows:

20	Discovery cut-off	July 26, 2013
21	Plaintiff's expert designation	July 26, 2013
22	Defendants' expert designations	August 26 2013
	Plaintiff's expert rebuttal	September 13, 2013
	Expert discovery cut-off	October 14, 2013.

23 All other dates remain the same, absent further agreement of counsel or court order.
24

25 Dated: May 15, 2013



26
27 SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge
28