

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Stevens v. Martinez

Stevens v. Martinez · No. 1:21-cv-01144-JLT-SKO (PC) · Decided April 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Defendants’ motion to vacate the deadline for filing merits-based dispositive motions. The court found good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), based on Plaintiff’s alleged failure to comply with a discovery order and Defendants’ pending motion for terminating sanctions. The May 22, 2025 dispositive-motion deadline was vacated and may be reset after resolution of the sanctions motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheila K. Oberto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	April 2, 2025
DOCKET	1:21-cv-01144-JLT-SKO (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to vacate the remaining deadline for filing merits-based dispositive motions pending resolution of their motion for terminating sanctions. The court granted the motion without requiring a response from Plaintiff.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A scheduling order may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent; the good-cause inquiry primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- sanctions
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- discovery
- sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendants demonstrated good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to vacate the deadline for filing merits-based dispositive motions pending resolution of their motion for terminating sanctions.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants demonstrated good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order and vacate the remaining deadline for filing merits-based dispositive motions pending resolution of the motion for terminating sanctions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Pursuant to Rule 16(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a scheduling order “may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent.”” (at 2)

“The Court finds Defendants have demonstrated good cause for a modification of the scheduling order.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had ordered Plaintiff to respond to Defendant Peterson's request for production concerning a Gender Identity Questionnaire after granting a motion to compel. Defendants asserted that Plaintiff had not provided the required response and that they could not adequately prepare a merits-based dispositive motion without the requested information. Defendants also had a pending motion for terminating sanctions that could potentially dispose of the action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court issued a discovery and scheduling order on April 1, 2024, and later granted Defendant Peterson's motion to compel, ordering Plaintiff to respond to a request for production. Defendants subsequently filed a motion for terminating sanctions based on Plaintiff's alleged failure to comply with the discovery order, followed by this motion to vacate the May 22, 2025 dispositive-motion deadline. The court granted the motion and vacated the deadline pending resolution of the sanctions motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)