

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 JOESEPH SOUTHWELL et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 MORTGAGE INVESTORS  
CORPORATION OF OHIO, INC.,

14 Defendant.  
15

CASE NO. C13-1289 MJP

ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION  
FOR RELIEF FROM A DEADLINE  
PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE  
7(D)(2)(A)

16 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Relief from a Deadline  
17 pursuant to LCR 7(d)(2)(A). (Dkt. No. 142.) Having reviewed the Motion, Defendant's  
18 Response (Dkt. No. 144), Plaintiffs' Reply (Dkt. No. 148), and all related papers, the Court  
19 hereby DENIES the motion.

20 According to LCR 16(b)(4), parties are bound by a Court's scheduling order; the  
21 schedule may be modified only upon a showing of good cause and with the judge's consent.  
22 Plaintiffs have not shown good cause to extend the dispositive motion deadline, particularly in  
23 light of the history of the case so far. As Defendant points out, in asking for extensions to the  
24

1 class certification deadline Plaintiffs asserted that they did not intend to file dispositive motions.  
2 (See Dkt. No 42; 43.) Now, on the day of the dispositive motion deadline, they request an  
3 extension on the basis of the one-way intervention rule. (Dkt. No. 142.) But as Defendant argues,  
4 Plaintiff could have filed a motion for summary judgment and asked the Court to exercise its  
5 discretion to decide the summary judgment motion prior to issuing an order on class  
6 certification. (Dkt. No. 144 at 10.)

7 The Motion for Relief from a Deadline is therefore DENIED.

8  
9 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

10 Dated this 8th day of July, 2014.

11  
12  
13 

14 Marsha J. Pechman  
15 Chief United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24