

1 filed just seven days before the discovery deadline in this case—February 9, 2009. Moreover, the only
2 reason given for the requested continuance of previous court-ordered deadlines is “for the purpose of
3 exploring settlement.” [Doc. No. 52 at 1.] The Court observes a settlement conference is already
4 scheduled on this Court’s calendar for March 25, 2009 at 2:00 p.m.

5 The parties have not demonstrated diligence in complying with dates previously set by the Court,
6 and have not demonstrated “good cause” for modifying the scheduling order, as required by Fed. R. Civ.
7 P. 16(b). *Zivkovic v. S. California Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002); *see, e.g., Johnson*
8 *v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 607-08 (9th Cir. 1992); *Worldtech Sys., Inc. v. Integrated*
9 *Network Solutions, Inc.*, 2008 WL 4145440 at *1-2 (E.D. Cal. Sep. 3, 2008).

10 Therefore, the Joint Motion to Amend the Scheduling Order is **DENIED**.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 DATED: February 4, 2009

13 

14 Hon. Nita L. Stormes
15 U.S. Magistrate Judge
16 United States District Court
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28