

1  
2  
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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL RODMAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
SAFEWAY INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. 11-cv-03003-JST

**ORDER AMENDING CASE SCHEDULE**

Re: ECF No. 243

Good cause appearing therefore, pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the case deadlines are modified as follows:

Event	Prior Deadline	New Deadline
Motion to decertify the class	3/2/2015	3/2/2015
Opposition to motion to decertify	3/23/2015	3/23/2015
Close of fact discovery	3/27/2015	Deadline to complete discovery that was served prior to 3/27/15: April 24, 2015
Deadline to complete mediation	3/27/2015	4/7/2015
Reply to opposition to motion to decertify	4/6/2015	4/6/2015
Designation of experts	4/10/2015	5/8/1015
Hearing on motion to decertify	4/23/2015	4/23/2015
Rebuttal expert designation	4/24/2015	5/22/2015
Expert discovery deadline	5/6/2015	6/5/2015
Damages summary judgment motion	5/15/2015	6/19/2015
Damages SJ Opposition	5/29/2015	7/8/2015
Damages summary judgment reply	6/5/2015	7/17/2015
Damages summary judgment hearing	6/18/2015	7/30/2015
Pretrial conference statement	9/11/15	9/01/2015
Pretrial conference	9/11/2015 at 2:00 p.m.	9/11/2015 at 2:00 p.m.
Trial	10/5/2015 at 8:30 a.m.	10/5/2015 at 8:30 a.m.
Estimate of trial length (in days)	Five	Five


United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1  
2  
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

Although the Court notes that the parties have expressed some concern that the trial date may need to be continued in light of the amended date of the summary judgment hearing, the Court believes the trial date should remain feasible even under the amended schedule. Trial dates set by this Court should be regarded as firm. Requests for continuance are disfavored. The Court will not consider any event subsequently scheduled by a party, party-controlled witness, expert or attorney that conflicts with the above trial date as good cause to grant a continuance. The Court will not consider the pendency of settlement discussions as good cause to grant a continuance.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 24, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JON S. TIGAR  
United States District Judge