

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 JOSEPH SERY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 HEAVY PUTTER, LLC, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17

Case No.: 3:17-cv-2334-JAH-NLS

**ORDER DENYING JOINT MOTION
TO CONTINUE DEADLINE FOR
MOTION FOR DETERMINATION
OF DISCOVERY DISPUTE NO. 1**

[ECF No. 25]

18 Before the Court is the parties' Joint Motion to Continue Motion for Determination
19 of Discovery Dispute No. 1. ECF No. 25. This is the second request to extend the
20 deadline. *See* ECF No. 20. The parties submit they are in the process of reviewing
21 documents and have been unable to resolve their disputes as to document requests
22 regarding alter ego allegations. ECF No. 25 at 1. The parties request the Court extend the
23 deadline to file a dispute regarding the alter ego requests by upwards of four months, to
24 September 30, 2018 and indicate that fact and expert discovery deadlines otherwise set
25 forth in the Scheduling Order may be affected. *Id.* The parties submit that the need for
26 court intervention will be limited if more time is allowed for the parties to produce and
27 review documents. *Id.*
28

1 Trial courts “set schedules and establish deadlines to foster the efficient treatment
2 and resolution of cases. Those efforts will be successful only if the deadlines are taken
3 seriously by the parties.” *Wong v. Regents of the Univ. of Calif.*, 410 F.3d 1052, 1060,
4 1062 (9th Cir. 2005). Courts set such schedules to permit the court and the parties to deal
5 with cases in a thorough and orderly manner, and they must be allowed to enforce them,
6 unless there are good reasons not to.” *Id.*

7 The parties have not presented good cause to support such a lengthy extension of
8 the deadline. As it stands, the discovery dispute on this issue remains three weeks away,
9 June 22, 2018. *See* ECF No. 23. The Court encourages the parties to continue to meet
10 and confer on the issues related to the document requests regarding alter ego and any
11 other discovery disputes; but continued production and review of documents for upwards
12 of four months does not present good cause. *See* Judge Stormes Civil Case Procedures, §
13 6(C)(2)(d) (“ongoing meet and confer efforts, rolling document productions or
14 supplemental responses do not extend the deadline”).

15 The parties Joint Motion to Continue Motion for Determination of Discovery
16 Dispute No. 1 is **DENIED**.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: June 1, 2018

19 
20

Hon. Nita L. Stormes
United States Magistrate Judge