

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIO DINERO SESSOMS,

No. C 13-00714 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. DARRIN BRIGHT,

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S
PROPOSED SCHEDULE**

Defendant.

In this prisoner civil rights case, in which plaintiff is represented by pro bono counsel, an order denied defendant's motion for summary judgment in December 2015. At that time, a second case management order issued, setting a trial date of May 31, 2016. Seven weeks before trial, plaintiff filed a motion to continue the trial date to February 2017. The reason given was that lead plaintiff's counsel (a junior lawyer) was having complications with her pregnancy and would not be able to try the case this May. Accordingly, an order granted the trial continuance.

Now, having already delayed the trial by several months, plaintiff moves to completely reopen discovery and set a new case management schedule with new dates for amendment of pleadings, fact discovery, initial disclosures, and dispositive motions. It is far too late in the case to hit the reset button and plaintiff has not shown good cause to amend the operative scheduling order. The only reason we are not beginning trial this month is because of plaintiff's counsel's medical issues. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion to set a new scheduling order and reopen discovery is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 13, 2016.



 WILLIAM ALSUP
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE