

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
28United States District Court
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYMANTEC CORPORATION,
Plaintiff,
v.
ACRONIS, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [12-cv-05331-JST](#)

**FURTHER CASE SCHEDULING
ORDER**

Dkt. Nos. 95, 96, 99, 100, 101

Having considered Plaintiff's Motion to Set A Date For the Close of Fact and Expert Discovery, ECF No. 95; Defendants' Opposition thereto, ECF No. 96; Defendants' Proposal Re Fact and Expert Discovery Dates, ECF No. 99; Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Proposal, ECF No. 100; and Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Response, ECF No. 101; and the court's order dated April 30, 2013, ECF No. 97, and good cause appearing, the court now sets the following additional case deadlines:

Event	Deadline
Fact discovery cut-off	September 30, 2013
Expert disclosures	November 8, 2013
Expert rebuttal	December 6, 2013
Expert discovery cut-off	January 7, 2014


Counsel may not modify these dates without leave of court. The parties shall comply with the Court's standing orders, which are available at cand.uscourts.gov/jstorders.

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

The parties must take all necessary steps to conduct discovery, compel discovery, hire counsel, retain experts, and manage their calendars so that they can complete discovery in a timely manner. All counsel must arrange their calendars to accommodate these dates, or arrange to substitute or associate in counsel who can.

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 dates as good cause to grant a continuance. The Court will not consider the pendency of settlement discussions as good cause to grant a continuance.

Dated: May 19, 2013



JON S. TIGAR
United States District Judge