

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

CALIFORNIA CAPITAL INSURANCE  
COMPANY,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
A.O. SMITH CORPORATION, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-02377-HSG

**SCHEDULING ORDER**

At the initial case management conference for this case on August 11, 2015, the Court asked the parties whether there were any issues with the Court’s proposed case deadlines. Dkt. No. 18. Both parties agreed that the schedule was acceptable and the Court entered the current scheduling order. See Dkt. No. 21.

On January 4, 2016, the parties filed a stipulated request to extend the case schedule by several months, stating that they are unable to meet the deadlines previously agreed to. Dkt. No. 27. At the January 12, 2016 case management conference, the Court directed the parties to file a joint statement identifying every person that needs to be deposed, including his or her role, and any new discovery issues that the parties contend necessitate an extension of the current scheduling order. See Dkt. No. 31. On January 15, 2016, the parties filed a joint statement further explaining the scope of the remaining anticipated discovery and the reasons for being unable to meet the previously agreed-upon case deadlines. Dkt. No. 32.

Although the Court is unpersuaded by the parties’ reliance on commonplace scheduling challenges as a justification for extending the case schedule by several months, the Court will grant a short extension based on the parties’ explanation in the joint statement. The Court expects the parties to meet and confer proactively, promptly and collaboratively resolve scheduling and

1 discovery matters, and keep this case on track. The parties must continue to focus and streamline  
2 the case appropriately: the Court notes, for example, that virtually all of the deposition topics  
3 Plaintiff lists are likely capable of being covered by a small number of witnesses. The Court  
4 remains skeptical that this case needs to be as complicated as the parties are representing it to be,  
5 and will view any further request for a continuance with extreme disfavor.

6 The Court sets the following case deadlines pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16  
7 and Civil Local Rule 16-10:

8 Event	New schedule
9 Close of Fact Discovery	March 18, 2016
10 Disclosure of Expert Witnesses	March 25, 2016
11 Disclose of Rebuttal Expert Witnesses	April 15, 2016
12 Mediation Deadline	April 20, 2016
13 Close of Expert Discovery	May 2, 2016
14 Dispositive Motion Hearing Date	June 16, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.
15 Pretrial Conference	September 6, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.
16 Jury Trial	September 19, 2016 at 8:30 a.m.

17 The parties are directed to review and comply with this Court's Civil Pretrial and Trial  
18 Standing Order.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 Dated: 1/20/2016

21  
22  
23   
24 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
25 United States District Judge  
26  
27  
28