IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 10-cv-00584-REB-MEH

JAMES WARREN, JESSICA WARREN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER RE: DISCOVERY DEADLINE AND RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND RULE 702 DEADLINE

Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge.

The Court held a telephone conference today with the parties to discuss the current discovery and trial deadlines. Pursuant to that discussion, the Court will extend the discovery deadline to November 15, 2010. All other deadlines set by, and conference dates held before, this Court shall remain the same in accordance with the current Scheduling Order and trial schedule.

In addition, the parties request that the deadline to file Rule 702 motions, currently set for November 1, 2010 pursuant to Judge Blackburn's Trial Preparation Order, be extended thirty (30) days to allow the parties to have consistency in pre-trial matters among the several related cases. The Court agrees that, until the pending motion to consolidate is resolved, it will be difficult to manage discovery in this case. Thus, because the parties have demonstrated good cause for the requested extension of time, the Court respectfully RECOMMENDS¹ that the District Court extend

¹Be advised that all parties shall have fourteen (14) days after service hereof to serve and file any written objections in order to obtain reconsideration by the District Judge to whom this case is

the deadline for filing Rule 702 motions to and including December 1, 2010.

Dated at Denver, Colorado, this 29th day of October, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

Michael E. Hegarty

United States Magistrate Judge

Michael E. Hegarty

assigned. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The party filing objections must specifically identify those findings or recommendations to which the objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusive or general objections. A party's failure to file such written objections to proposed findings and recommendations contained in this report may bar the party from a <u>de novo</u> determination by the District Judge of the proposed findings and recommendations. *United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 676-83 (1980); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Additionally, the failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy may bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted or adopted by the District Court. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985); *Moore v. United States*, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991); *Niehaus v. Kansas Bar Ass'n*, 793 F.2d 1159, 1164 (10th Cir. 1986).