1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	BERNARDO LUQUE-VILLANUEVA, et al.,	Case No.: 16cv2945-GPC (NLS)
12	Plaintiffs,	ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
13	V.	DENYING IN PART JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
14	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, et al.,	TIME
15	Defendants.	[ECF No. 34]
16		
17		
18		
19	Before the Court is the parties' joint motion to enlarge time to file a joint motion	
20	for determination of a discovery dispute and to enlarge fact discovery, expert discovery,	
21	and pre-trial motion dates. ECF No. 34.	

As to the discovery dispute deadline, the parties represent that Defendants have produced some documents to Plaintiffs after the Protective Order was issued. ECF No. 34-1 at 4. The parties further represent that they are working together to resolve the remaining disputes and Defendants are searching for the documents that Plaintiffs requested. Id. at 5-6. The Court finds good cause to **GRANT** the motion to enlarge time to file a joint motion for discovery dispute from January 25, 2018 to March 2, 2018. The Court cautions the parties that this is the third extension that has been granted (see ECF

Nos. 29, 31) and any further requests are likely to be denied barring extraordinary circumstances.

As to the request to enlarge fact discovery cutoff, expert discovery dates, and the pre-trial motions deadline, the Court **DENIES** the request. This is the third request to enlarge pre-trial dates, the previous two which the Court granted. ECF Nos. 24, 29. The parties generally state that more time is needed due to the delay in getting the discovery related to the discovery dispute, but fail to explain why they are unable to meet the specific deadlines. Thus, the Court finds that the parties have not shown good cause to extend the deadlines at this time.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 25, 2018

Hon. Nita L. Stormes United States Magistrate Judge