

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

CESSNA FINANCE CORP.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
JETSUITE, INC. and JS CJ3 LLC,)
)
Defendants.)

Case No.: 18-1095-EFM-KGG

_____)
)
JETSUITE, INC. and JS CJ3 LLC,)
)
Counterclaim Plaintiffs,)
)
v.)
)
CESSNA FINANCE CORP., *et al.*,)
)
Counterclaim Defendants,)
_____)

ORDER ON MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINES

The above-captioned case relates to failure to pay for certain aircraft and the subsequent abandoning thereof. (Doc. 1, at 6.) A companion case (hereinafter “the Textron case”) relating to the failure to pay on maintenance agreements on these aircraft is also pending before the District Court. (*See* No. 18-1187, Doc. 1, at 2-3.)

On February 13, 2020, the Court held an in-person hearing relating to three overlapping discovery motions pending in these two cases. (*See* Doc. 117.) The Court ruled on some issues at the hearing. The Court’s remaining rulings on those motions will be addressed by separate Order.¹ The Court also dealt with motions to extend the expert disclosure deadlines in both cases (Doc. 128; No. 18-1187, Doc. 140). The motion to extend pending in this case is the subject of the present Order.

Defendants request that “proponent expert disclosures for experts who may rely on documents that are the subject of [Defendant’s] pending motions to compel be due 90 days after the production of all documents compelled in connection with those motions.” (Doc. 128, at 1.) Plaintiff Cessna Finance is the only party opposing this motion. (Doc. 129.) Plaintiff indicates that

[b]efore the Motion was filed, counsel for CFC advised JetSuite’s counsel that CFC did not object in principle to a 60-day extension of time for JetSuite’s liability experts, who it claims may need to rely upon documents that are the subject of the pending Motions to Compel. CFC, however, wanted a date specific, not a date tied to a production that has not been ordered.

(*Id.*, at 1.) Plaintiff continued that “[r]egardless of the date/time period, however, CFC should have an equal amount of time after JetSuite produces its reports,

¹ At the hearing, the Court also addressed an additional Motion to Compel in the Textron case, which is the subject of a separate Order in that case.

which is something the parties discussed and CFC believes JetSuite agreed to in the exchange.” (*Id.*, at 1-2.)

At the hearing, the Court **GRANTED in part** the motion to extend. The expert deadlines in both cases were **suspended**. The Court informed the parties that this may result in the remaining deadlines in the case being extended at a later time. The Court set an in-person status conference for both cases to occur on March 24, 2020, at 1:30 p.m. The parties were instructed to provide the Court with a joint memo outlining what should be addressed at the status conference no later than March 17, 2020. The expert deadlines and all subsequent deadlines will be re-set at that time.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant’s Unopposed Motion to Extend Expert Disclosure Deadlines (Doc. 128) is **GRANTED in part** as more fully set forth above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 14th day of February, 2020, at Wichita, Kansas.

s/ KENNETH G. GALE
HON. KENNETH G. GALE
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE