

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

Northern District of California

10

Oakland Division

11

ANDREW H. MEISEL, *et al.*,

No. C 10-01786 LB

12

Plaintiffs,

**REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER**

13

v.

14

MARK KAUFMAN, *et al.*,

15

Defendants.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

This matter is currently set for trial on July 25, 2011. ECF No. 55 at 2.<sup>1</sup> The parties ceased discovery at the end of March while they engaged in substantive settlement negotiations. Joint CMC Statement, ECF No. 92 at 4, 6. With significant uncertainties now surrounding an on-record settlement, the parties ask the court to continue the trial for a maximum of four months. *See id.* at 4.

Following a case management conference on June 23, 2011, the court revises its scheduling order as follows:

Case Event	Date
Non-expert discovery completion date	9/30/2011
Expert disclosures required by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	9/30/2011
Rebuttal expert disclosures	10/10/2011

<sup>1</sup> Citations are to the Electronic Case File (“ECF”) with pin cites to the electronic page number at the top of the document, not the pages at the bottom.

1	Expert discovery completion date	10/30/2011
2	Last hearing date for dispositive motions	8/4/2011, at 11:00 a.m.
3	Meet and confer re pretrial filings	10/4/2011
4	Pretrial filings due	10/13/2011
5	Oppositions, Objections, Exhibits, and Depo Designations due	10/20/2011
6	Final Pretrial Conference	11/3/2011, at 10:30 a.m.
7	Trial	11/14/2011, at 8:30 a.m

8 If, after meeting and conferring, the parties would like to modify these dates, the court **ORDERS**  
9 the parties to file a joint stipulation before July 28, 2011. The court reminds the parties that the  
10 October 20, 2011 deadline and those thereafter may not be modified by stipulation.

11 Mindful of the limited time between now and trial, the court also modifies its standing order to  
12 limit any joint discovery letter to four pages with the parties' positions laid out side-by-side.

13 At the June 23 case management conference, with regard to Plaintiffs' pending motion to enforce  
14 the settlement, Defendants asked whether the court's objectivity would be compromised if the matter  
15 proceeded to trial. The court confirmed that its objectivity would not be impaired.

16 Defendants also asked the court to extend their time to file their opposition brief to June 27, 2011  
17 because a staff member of Defendants' counsel was ill. The court **GRANTS** Defendants' request  
18 and extends their time to file their opposition brief until 5:00 p.m. on June 27, 2011. After the case  
19 management conference, Plaintiffs filed a letter requesting the court extend its time to file a response  
20 to July 14, 2011. ECF No. 93 at 2. Plaintiffs explained that the attorney working on the motion  
21 would be out of the office from July 2 to July 10, 2011. *Id.* at 1. Because the court has granted  
22 Defendants' late request and the extension keeps to the standard 35-day briefing schedule, the court  
23 further **ORDERS** that Plaintiffs' time to file their optional reply brief is extended to July 14, 2011.

24 Defendants also stated their intention to file a cross-motion for summary judgment. The court  
25 **ORDERS** the parties to meet and confer regarding the scheduling of the hearings.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27 Dated: June 24, 2011



28  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LAUREL BEELER  
United States Magistrate Judge