

The Court is in receipt of the parties' Stipulation to Extend Discovery Deadlines and Continue Trial Date filed January 22, 2018. (Dkt. No. 77.) The Court **DENIES** the request to continue the trial date and related deadlines. Trial continuances are disfavored. The burden and disruption that result "counsel[] against continuances except for compelling reasons." *Morris v. Slappy*, 461 U.S. 1, 11 (1983); *accord Payne v. Jones*, 711 F.3d 85, 92 (2d Cir. 2013); *see, e.g.*, California Rule of Court 3.1332(c) (listing circumstances that may support trial continuance).

Here, not even a minimal showing was made. New counsel, hired last fall, must have been aware that the case had a trial date set for February 4, 2019. If counsel could not commit to the date, they should not have accepted the engagement. The Court will consider a request to extend dates not related to the trial specifically, or any motion practice, as long as the parties understand that moving such deadlines may mean that they may have to dual-track motion practice and trial preparation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 26, 2018

neve Gual Mice

VVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27