

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 08-cv-01704-PAB-MJW

RONALD E. FIELDS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WALGREENS COMPANY,
a/k/a WALGREENS CO.,

Defendant.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby ORDERED that the Pro Se Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate Minute Order Denying as Moot [59] Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendant's Motion for Entry of Protective Order Concerning Confidential Information (docket no. 74) is DENIED. The Pro Se Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate any basis in law or fact for this court to reconsider its minute order (docket no. 59). Moreover, for those additional reasons as outlined in the response (docket no. 76) that this court incorporates by reference, the subject motion (docket no. 74) should be denied.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Pro Se Plaintiff's Motion to Reinstate Undisputed Fact (Section 4) Numbers 1 through 20, Removed from Scheduling Order October 24, 2008, and Approved November 3, 2008 (docket no. 71) is DENIED. Numbers 1 through 20 were removed from the Rule 16 Scheduling Order under Undisputed Facts (Section 4) because there was no agreement between the parties as to numbers 1 through 20 when this court conducted the Rule 16 Scheduling Conference and therefore by definition are not undisputed. See extensive record made by Magistrate Judge Watanabe during the Rule 16 Scheduling Conference on October 24, 2008 (docket no. 20).

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's Amended Motion for Extension of Time to File Dispositive Motions (docket no. 64) is GRANTED finding good cause shown. In this case, there have been numerous disputed discovery motions filed with this court. See docket. Moreover, this court had to personally supervise Plaintiff's deposition at the Arraj United States Courthouse due to the many disagreements between the parties on the scope of discovery and during the Pro Se Plaintiff's deposition. These disputed motions concerning discovery were pending and had not yet been ruled upon on April 30, 2009, which was the deadline to file dispositive motions. See docket no. 20. It is clear that the parties needed rulings on numerous

disputed discovery motions before they could have filed their dispositive motions. This court has since ruled on such disputed discovery motions. Accordingly, good cause has been shown to allow an extension of time to file dispositive motions to May 29, 2009. The Rule 16 Scheduling Order is amended in that the deadline to file dispositive motions is extended to May 29, 2009. The court notes that there is no trial date set at this time.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Pro Se Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendant's Motion for Extension of Time and Defendant's Amended Motion for Extension of Time "To File Dispositive Motions" (docket no. 70) is DENIED for those reasons stated above and for those additional reasons that are outlined in Defendant's response (docket no. 78) that this court incorporates by reference in this minute order.
Date: June 17, 2009
