

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

JANET HALEY,
Plaintiff,

No. C 10-3856 PJH

v.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF**

COHEN & STEERS CAPITAL
MANAGEMENT, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

_____ /

The court is in receipt of plaintiff's motion for administrative relief for extension of the fact discovery period for the purpose of completing certain limited discovery, as well as defendants' oppositions thereto. Plaintiff filed her request on January 12, 2012 – one day prior to the fact discovery cutoff. Plaintiff seeks a forty-five day extension from the date on which a ruling is secured in connection with an underlying motion for leave to obtain and complete additional deposition testimony, so that in the event plaintiff's underlying motion is granted, plaintiff might complete the requested additional discovery. The hearing on plaintiff's underlying motion has been scheduled for March 20, 2012.

Plaintiff's motion for administrative relief is DENIED. If granted, plaintiff's request would likely require the court to extend subsequent deadlines set forth in the pretrial order, particularly in view of the fact that the hearing on plaintiff's underlying motion is scheduled one day prior to the March 21 deadline for hearing dispositive motions, and several weeks *after* the February 15 deadline for submitting dispositive motions. As the court made clear in its prior order denying plaintiff's motion for leave to amend, the court requires 120 between the hearing for dispositive motions and the trial date, and is unlikely to adjust one

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 date without adjusting the other.

2 Furthermore, and as highlighted in defendants' oppositions to the instant request,
3 plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that good cause exists for modifying the pretrial schedule
4 in the manner plaintiff requests, given plaintiff's lack of diligence in seeking the underlying
5 discovery, and the prejudice likely to inure to defendants in the event plaintiff's request is
6 granted.

7

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated: January 24, 2012



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28