1	I construction of the second se	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	AT SEATTLE	
10	JOESEPH SOUTHWELL and JERRY BLAND,	CASE NO. C13-1289 MJP
11	Plaintiffs,	ORDER ON JOINT SUBMISSION RE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
12	V.	EXTEND DISCOVERY CUT-OFF DEADLINE
13	v.	DEADLINE
14	MORTGAGE INVESTORS CORPORATION OF OHIO, INC.,	
15	Defendant.	
16		•
17	THIS MATTER comes before the Court on the LCR 37 Joint Motion regarding	
18	Plaintiffs' motion to extend the discovery cut-off deadline. (Dkt. No. 127.) Having reviewed the	
19	Joint Motion and all related papers, the Court hereby DENIES Plaintiff's motion to extend the	
20	discovery cut-off deadline, but allows Plaintiffs leave to bring a motion after that deadline if it is	
21	based on a privilege log produced near that deadline.	
22	"A schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." LCR	
23	16(b)(4). Plaintiffs argue the discovery cut-off should be moved because Defendant has not	
24	4 didentified which documents are responsive to which discovery requests (Dkt. No. 127 at 5–6),	
ORDER ON JOINT SUBMISSION RE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY CUT-OFF DEADLINE- 1		

but as the Court has previously noted, Defendant is not required to do make such identifications
if it has elected to produce documents as they are kept in the usual course of business. (See Dkt.
No. 116.) Plaintiff also contends it will not be able to challenge documents wrongly withheld on
the basis of privilege if Defendant does not produce its privilege log until the final days of
discovery. (Dkt. No. 127 at 6.) The Court agrees with this limited point and therefore permits
Plaintiff to file one motion in LCR 37 form if it is based on a privilege log supplied near the
discovery cut-off deadline within ten (10) days of this Order.

The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

Dated this 23rd day of May, 2014.

Maeshuf Helens

Marsha J. Pechman United States District Judge