



1 Plaintiff submits in opposition that the extension should be limited to 30 days because it had  
2 previously stipulated to Defendant GEM's initial request to a 30-day extension. Docket No. 458 at 3. In  
3 opposition to Defendant GEM's submissions, Plaintiff submits that: (1) outstanding discovery will be  
4 substantially completed prior to the March 13, 2018 deadline; (2) the discovery dispute is not "ongoing"  
5 as the Court has ordered Defendant GEM to provide supplemental responses; (3) an anticipated challenge  
6 to the Court's order does not permit Defendant GEM to withhold discovery; (4) Plaintiff's supplemental  
7 production is unlikely to affect compliance with the March 13, 2018 deadline; and (5) Defendant GEM's  
8 submissions as to its other upcoming deadlines are "vague and unsupported." *Id.* at 6-7.

9 The Court finds that good cause has been shown for a 30-day extension. Accordingly, Defendant  
10 GEM's motion to extend the joint proposed pretrial order is **GRANTED** in part. Docket No. 456. The  
11 joint proposed pretrial order is due April 12, 2018.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: March 1, 2018

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 NANCY J. KOPPE  
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28