

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Alberto Blanco Onofre, et al. v. Ford Motor Company, et al.

Onofre · No. 25cv485-TWR (MSB) · Decided October 14, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California partially granted the parties’ joint motion to amend the scheduling order in this Ford Motor Company litigation. The court found good cause to extend discovery, expert-designation, motion, settlement, and pretrial deadlines, while reminding the parties to comply with the magistrate judge’s chambers rules for future continuance requests.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael S. Berg
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	October 14, 2025
DOCKET	25cv485-TWR (MSB)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly moved to amend the scheduling order and extend discovery and pretrial deadlines.
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	Unknown; district court scheduling order with no reported citation

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties established good cause to modify the scheduling order and extend discovery and pretrial deadlines.
2. Whether the joint motion should be granted despite being filed after the first affected deadline and failing to comply with the magistrate judge's chambers rules.

HOLDINGS

1. The court may modify the scheduling order upon a showing of good cause, with diligence being the primary consideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4).
2. The court granted the joint motion in part and issued an amended scheduling order, while declining to approve the requested continuances as submitted because the motion was filed after the first affected deadline, lacked the required counsel declaration, and sought changes to pretrial dates before the district judge.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A scheduling order “may be modified only for good cause and with the judge’s consent.”” (2)

“This good cause standard “primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the extension.”” (2)

“If that party was not diligent, the inquiry should end.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

At the time of the motion, depositions of the plaintiffs and Ricardo Blanco were incomplete, and Ford anticipated potential discovery disputes concerning those depositions. The parties reported that they were working diligently to complete discovery, including Ford's deposition of its most qualified person and meet-and-confer efforts concerning plaintiffs' second request for production of documents.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs and Ford Motor Company filed a joint stipulation that the court construed as a joint motion under Civil Local Rule 7.2. The court found that the motion was untimely and did not comply with chambers-rule requirements, but granted it in part because it was the parties' first request and the record established good cause for an approximately forty-five-day extension.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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