

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Roddy Mac v. EA Family Services

Mac v. EA Family Services · No. 2:24-cv-02702-DC-CSK · Decided April 11, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a scheduling order issued in Mac v. EA Family Services, No. 2:24-cv-02702-DC-CSK, by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. It establishes discovery and motion deadlines, settlement-conference requirements, procedures for the final pretrial conference, and requirements for modifying the schedule.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dena Coggins
DECIDED	April 11, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02702-DC-CSK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued a scheduling order after conducting a Rule 16 scheduling conference in this civil action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A magistrate judge's discovery ruling may be modified by the district court only if the ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Roddy Mac v. EA Family Services

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- joinder
- motion to amend
- mediation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment benefits
- ERISA

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What case-management schedule and procedural requirements should govern the action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)?

2. What showing is required to obtain leave to amend the pleadings or modify the scheduling order after the applicable deadlines?
3. What procedures govern discovery disputes and review of discovery rulings by the assigned magistrate judge?

HOLDINGS

1. After entry of the scheduling order, joinder of additional parties, amendment of pleadings, and modification of the schedule require leave of court and a showing of good cause. A request to amend under Rule 15(a) must also avoid prejudice, undue delay, bad faith, and futility.
2. Discovery matters that do not implicate the case schedule are referred to the assigned magistrate judge, whose written discovery ruling is final subject to district-court modification only upon a showing that the ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case was pending in the Eastern District of California, and the named defendant had been served. The parties reported that they did not anticipate additional joinder or pleading amendments, had completed initial disclosures, and had no related litigation pending. The court established deadlines for fact and expert discovery, motions, settlement proceedings, and final pretrial proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The scheduling conference was conducted on April 11, 2025, with counsel appearing for both parties. The court entered a case schedule governing service, amendment and joinder, discovery, motions, settlement, pretrial proceedings, and modification of the schedule.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)