

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

INGENCO HOLDINGS, LLC, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE
COMPANY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C13-543RAJ

ORDER

The court VACATES the August 24 trial date and all pending pretrial deadlines. It will set new deadlines, if necessary, when it rules on the pending motions in this case.

The court has delayed trial in this matter twice, both times at the request of the parties. It denied another request for a continuance. Trial has already been delayed by nearly seven months for the parties' convenience. Regrettably, the court continues the trial date again now.

This time, it is the parties' protracted disputes over sealing documents that lead the court to continue trial. Much ink has been spilled over those disputes already; for now it suffices to say that the recent motion of third party Guild Associates makes clear that those issues will require substantial additional work to resolve. Guild's motion just became ripe last week. The parties have indicated to the court's in-court deputy clerk that their uncertainty over what material will be kept under seal is complicating their trial

ORDER – 1

1 preparation,¹ and the court has declined to consider the parties' dispositive motions until
2 it resolves those disputes (or at least receives complete information from the parties and
3 Guild).

4 Rather than set a new trial date and deadlines for motions in limine, trial briefs,
5 proposed jury instructions, and other final pretrial filings, the court will set a new trial
6 date and deadlines if necessary when it resolves all of the pending motions. The court
7 cannot say with any certainty when it will be able to resolve the motions before it.

8 DATED this 16th day of July, 2015.

9
10 

11 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
12 United States District Court Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ The court does not know what the parties' disputes are regarding sealed material with respect to
27 trial preparation, but to the extent that any party believes that the court will seal or otherwise
28 shield from public view the exhibits or depositions that the parties rely on at trial, that party is
mistaken.