

1 days from the issuance of an order on the motion for additional discovery) *with* Local Rule 26-1(b)(1)
2 (providing that discovery plans must provide “the calendar date on which discovery will close”). The
3 Court finds the better approach to be that Plaintiff should propound the discovery that he believes is proper
4 during the extended 120-day discovery period. To the extent Defendants believe that any such discovery
5 is not proper, including that it is untimely given the parties’ prior stipulations and/or the Court’s prior
6 orders, then they may file a motion for protective order or seek other appropriate relief from the Court
7 following a pre-filing conference and in compliance with all other applicable requirements.¹ If the parties
8 are unable to agree on that discovery, the Court would have before it a concrete dispute and copies of any
9 disputed discovery actually propounded. *See* Local Rule 26-7(b).

10 Accordingly, the stipulation is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part as follows. The discovery
11 cutoff is hereby **EXTENDED** to September 1, 2017. The deadline for discovery motions is hereby
12 **EXTENDED** to October 2, 2017. The deadline for dispositive motions is hereby **EXTENDED** to
13 November 1, 2017. The deadline for filing the joint proposed pretrial order is **EXTENDED** to December
14 1, 2017, unless a dispositive motion is pending at that time. *See* Local Rule 26-1(b)(5).

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.
16 DATED: May 4, 2017

17 
18 _____
19 NANCY J. KOPPE
20 United States Magistrate Judge

21
22
23
24
25 _____
26 ¹ The Court herein expresses no opinion as to whether the additional discovery is proper. The
27 pending stipulation provides extra time for briefing the proposed motion for additional discovery. Docket
28 No. 104 at 4. To be clear, any motion filed by Defendant as outlined here shall be briefed pursuant to the
default briefing schedule, Local Rule 7-2(b) (providing 14 days for a response and 7 days for a reply), unless
otherwise ordered by the Court.