

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 12-cv-02531-REB-MEH

ESTATE OF JIMMA PAL REAT,
JAMES PAL REAT,
REBECCA AWOK DIAG,
RAN PAL,
CHANGKUOTH PAL, and
JOSEPH KOLONG,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JUAN JESUS RODRIGUEZ, and
CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,

Defendants.

ORDER AND RECOMMENDATION

Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge.

The parties' Stipulated Motion to Amend Scheduling Order and Vacate and Reset Combined Trial Preparation Conference / Final Pretrial Conference and Jury Trial [[filed March 6, 2014; docket # 149](#)] is **granted in part and denied in part** as follows. For good cause shown, this Court ORDERS that Paragraph 9 of the Scheduling Order [docket # 120] shall be modified as follows:

Initial expert designation:	May 30, 2014
Rebuttal expert designation:	June 27, 2014
Discovery cutoff:	July 18, 2014
Dispositive motions deadline:	August 15, 2014

In addition, this Court respectfully RECOMMENDS that the combined Trial Preparation Conference and Final Pretrial Conference set for **June 13, 2014**, and the eight-day trial set to begin **June 30, 2014**, [docket # 119] be **vacated** and **reset** as Judge Blackburn's calendar permits.¹

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

Dated and entered this 7th day of March, 2014, in Denver, Colorado.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael E. Hegarty". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "M".

Michael E. Hegarty
United States Magistrate Judge

assigned. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. 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 *de novo* 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).