

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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

CARMEN GUZMAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MADISON VINEYARD HOLDINGS, LLC,  
Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-00404-JST

**SCHEDULING ORDER**

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

Event	Deadline
Deadline to add parties or amend the pleadings	June 1, 2016
Fact discovery cut-off	December 23, 2016
Expert disclosures	January 20, 2017
Expert rebuttal	February 10, 2017
Expert discovery cut-off	March 17, 2017
Deadline to file dispositive motions	March 17, 2017
Pretrial conference statement due	May 30, 2017
Pretrial conference	June 9, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.
Trial	July 10, 2017 at 8:30 a.m.

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

Event	Deadline
Estimate of trial length (in days)	Eight

This case will be tried to a jury.

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](http://cand.uscourts.gov/jstorders).

Unless the Court orders otherwise, all filing and service deadlines occur at 5:00 p.m. on the stated date.

At the parties' request, the Court will refer them to the Court's mediation program, and order them to complete mediation within 90 days of the date of this order.

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 and appear at trial on the noticed and scheduled dates. All counsel must arrange their calendars to accommodate these dates, or arrange to substitute or associate in counsel who can.

Trial dates set by this Court should be regarded as firm. 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 trial date as good cause to grant a continuance. The Court will not consider the pendency of settlement discussions as good cause to grant a continuance.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 4, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JON S. TIGAR  
United States District Judge