

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUSAN HUNT,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY,  
Defendant.

Case No. 13-cv-05966-HSG

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO SET  
CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Re: Dkt. No. 87

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s Administrative Motion for an Order Shortening Time For Hearing On The Parties’ Joint Discovery Letters, which also requests a case management conference before May 3, 2015. Dkt. No 87. Judge Ryu has set a hearing regarding the parties’ current discovery disputes on May 8, 2015, on shortened time. Dkt. Nos. 79, 81 and 88.

The Court DENIES Plaintiff’s request to set a case management conference before May 3, 2015. The Court will determine what, if any, extension of any deadline is warranted after the resolution of the matters to be heard on May 8, 2015. The Court also will decide at that time whether a case management conference is necessary.

The Court has already extended the discovery cutoff date twice in less than two months. The fact that so many purportedly unresolvable issues are arising at this late date in a case pending since December 2013 does not speak well of the parties’ meet and confer efforts. The Court takes a dim view of timing “emergencies” that could and should have been averted by earlier good-faith discussion and cooperation.


Before either party seeks any further extension of time, the parties are again directed to meet and confer in good faith to determine whether a joint proposal is possible. Meeting and conferring does not mean each side reciting its position, then declaring that a standoff exists which requires the Court’s “assistance” to resolve. Rather, the meet and confer process described in the

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

Court's Civil Standing Order requires the parties to focus on identifying the core disputes, narrowing such disputes where possible, and striving to agree on a reasonable proposed resolution whenever possible.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 4/28/2015

  
HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge