

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
**Magistrate Judge Kathleen M. Tafoya**

Civil Action No. 11-cv-03408-CMA-KMT

CHARLOTTE TIMMONS,

Plaintiff,

v.

LOCKHEED MARTIN CORP,

Defendant.

---

**MINUTE ORDER**

---

**ORDER ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KATHLEEN M. TAFOYA**

“Plaintiff’s Motion to Extend Discovery” (Doc. No. 16, filed Oct. 29, 2012) is DENIED for failure to show good cause pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4). *See also Pumpco, Inc. v. Schenker Int’l, Inc.*, 204 F.R.D. 667, 668 (D. Colo. 2008) (“‘good cause’ means that scheduling deadlines cannot be met despite a party’s diligent efforts.”) Although Plaintiff argues that discovery should be extended because she believes that “additional witnesses in the Denver area should be deposed,” Plaintiff does not specify who these proposed deponents are, or why she was unable to take their depositions prior to the existing discovery cut-off. Furthermore, while Plaintiff’s counsel may have “had an extended vacation out of the court, and a trial thereafter that ran longer than expected,” District Judge Christine M. Arguello’s practice standards explicitly state that “[u]nless the circumstances are truly **unanticipated and unavoidable** . . . pressure of other business[] and scheduling conflicts” do not constitute good cause for an extension of time. CMA Civ. Practice Standards III.D.1. Plaintiff has not argued that either of these circumstances were unanticipated or unavoidable.

Dated: October 30, 2012