1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	THERANOS, INC.,
11	Plaintiff, No. C 14-04880 WHA
12	V.
13	BECTON DICKINSON AND ORDER DENYING STIPULATED COMPANY, REQUEST FOR EXTENSION
14	Defendant.
15	/
1 /	
16 17	The parties have filed a joint stipulation seeking extensions of six to eight weeks on all
17	The parties have filed a joint stipulation seeking extensions of six to eight weeks on all deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting
17 18	
17 18 19	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting
17 18	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were
17 18 19 20	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were delayed in part by the selected mediator's medical issues, and plaintiff brought on a new general
17 18 19 20 21	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were delayed in part by the selected mediator's medical issues, and plaintiff brought on a new general counsel. None of these is persuasive. The scheduling order in this case gave the parties more
 17 18 19 20 21 22 	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were delayed in part by the selected mediator's medical issues, and plaintiff brought on a new general counsel. None of these is persuasive. The scheduling order in this case gave the parties more time for discovery than they asked for in their joint case management statement, and in
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were delayed in part by the selected mediator's medical issues, and plaintiff brought on a new general counsel. None of these is persuasive. The scheduling order in this case gave the parties more time for discovery than they asked for in their joint case management statement, and in particular, it is their own fault they wasted time on protective order disputes. Accordingly, the
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were delayed in part by the selected mediator's medical issues, and plaintiff brought on a new general counsel. None of these is persuasive. The scheduling order in this case gave the parties more time for discovery than they asked for in their joint case management statement, and in particular, it is their own fault they wasted time on protective order disputes. Accordingly, the
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were delayed in part by the selected mediator's medical issues, and plaintiff brought on a new general counsel. None of these is persuasive. The scheduling order in this case gave the parties more time for discovery than they asked for in their joint case management statement, and in particular, it is their own fault they wasted time on protective order disputes. Accordingly, the parties' request for an extension is DENIED . All deadlines remain in place.
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	deadlines in this case. The reasons offered are that the parties were delayed in conducting discovery because they could not agree on a protective order, their early mediation efforts were delayed in part by the selected mediator's medical issues, and plaintiff brought on a new general counsel. None of these is persuasive. The scheduling order in this case gave the parties more time for discovery than they asked for in their joint case management statement, and in particular, it is their own fault they wasted time on protective order disputes. Accordingly, the parties' request for an extension is DENIED . All deadlines remain in place.