

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 GREGORY P. WILSON,

No. C 11-01547 WHA

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

**ORDER DENYING
REQUEST FOR EXTENSION**

13 SAUSE BROS., and DOES ONE
14 THROUGH TEN, Inclusive,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 The case management order requires the parties to file a definitive schedule for
18 depositions of all witnesses disclosed under Rule 26(a) by today, August 31, 2011 (Dkt. No. 22
19 at ¶ 3). Instead, the parties filed a request for an extension of the deadline. The parties explain
20 that plaintiff's deposition, which is scheduled for September 13, 2011, "will be informative" in
21 determining which witnesses should be deposed (Dkt. No. 24). The request is **DENIED**. A
22 deposition schedule must be filed **TODAY** as required by the case management order. If it later
23 becomes advisable to amend the schedule, the parties may file a motion to do so.

24
25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26
27 Dated: August 31, 2011.

28 

WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE