| Lafferty v. Liu | et al  |   |
|-----------------|--|---|
|                 |  |   |
|                 |  |   |
|                 |  |   |
| 1               |  |   |
| 2               |  |   |
| 3               |  |   |
| 4               |  |   |
| 5               |  |   |
| 6               |  |   |
| 7               | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON |   |
| 8               | AT SEATTLE   |   |
| 9               | SHANE LAFFERTY, a single person,                               | )   |
| 10              | Plaintiff,   | ) CASE NO. C17-0749RSM  |
| 11              |  |   |
| 12              | V.   | <ul><li>) ORDER DENYING STIPULATED</li><li>) MOTION TO DEPOSE PLAINTIFF</li></ul> |
| 13              | CHRISTOPHER LIU, et al.,                                       | )   |
| 14              | Defendants.  | )   |
| 15              |  | )   |

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Motion to Depose Incarcerated Plaintiff. Dkt. #51.

First, some procedural history. The parties have previously stipulated to continue trial twice. Dkts. #15 and #18. Each time the deadline for discovery has been extended. The current deadline for discovery motions passed on May 25, 2018, and the discovery cut-off was June 25, 2018. Dkt. #20. The parties filed this Motion on June 26, 2018.

In the instant Motion, the parties seek leave under Rule 30(a) to depose Plaintiff who is incarcerated and to extend the discovery cut-off to August 31, 2018, for that purpose. Dkt. #51. The parties make no mention of the above expired deadlines. Understandably, the parties argue that this deponent's "testimony is important to this action." *Id.* at 1–2. However, the parties fail

28

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION TO DEPOSE PLAINTIFF - 1

to explain why Plaintiff could not have been deposed earlier, and why they waited until after discovery closed to make the instant Motion.

The Court finds the parties have failed to show good cause for modification of the Scheduling Order. Accordingly, having considered the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that the parties' Stipulated Motion to Depose Incarcerated Plaintiff, Dkt. #51, is DENIED.

DATED this 26th day of June, 2018.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE