

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Brian Holtsclaw, individually and for others similarly situated v.
Stake Center Locating, LLC, a Utah limited liability company

Holtsclaw · No. 1:24-cv-00490-RMR-SBP · Decided January 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado granted Plaintiff Brian Holtsclaw’s motion for a three-week extension of the deadline to file a motion for class certification. The court found good cause based on the timing, volume, and organization of class-wide pay data produced by Defendant, and concluded that Plaintiff had acted diligently and that Defendant would not be prejudiced. The court accepted the class-certification motion as timely when filed within twenty-one days of the original September 2, 2025 deadline.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan Prose
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
DECIDED	January 7, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00490-RMR-SBP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for an extension of time to file a motion for class certification after Defendant produced class-wide pay data. The magistrate judge granted the motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The decision whether to modify a scheduling order is committed to the sound discretion of the trial court; modification requires good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; unpublished district-court order.
PARTIES	Brian Holtsclaw, individually and for others similarly situated v. Stake Center Locating, LLC, a Utah limited liability company

TOPICS

- class actions
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

class actions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b) to extend the scheduling-order deadline for filing a class-certification motion.
2. Whether the relevant factors governing modification of a scheduling order favored granting Plaintiff's requested three-week extension.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause existed to extend the deadline because Plaintiff adequately explained the delay, demonstrated sufficient diligence, and showed that the deadline could not reasonably be met despite diligent efforts.
2. The factors favored granting Plaintiff's motion because the first, third, fourth, and fifth factors favored Plaintiff, the sixth was neutral, and Defendant's opposition alone was insufficient to outweigh the other considerations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Scheduling order deadlines "may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent.""
(Analysis)

"Properly construed, 'good cause' means that scheduling deadlines cannot be met despite a party's diligent efforts." (Analysis)

"For the reasons above, the court GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time." (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant produced class-wide pay data on August 22, 2025, shortly before the September 2, 2025 class-certification deadline. Plaintiff's counsel delayed approximately one week in attempting to access the production because counsel believed a passphrase was required and had not yet been provided. Plaintiff also asserted that the production was more voluminous and less organized than anticipated, requiring additional time to review despite diligent efforts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had set September 2, 2025 as the deadline for Plaintiff's class-certification motion. Defendant produced class-wide pay data on August 22, 2025, and Plaintiff sought a three-week extension to access and review the production. Defendant opposed the extension, but the court found good cause and accepted Plaintiff's class-certification motion, filed within twenty-one days of the original deadline, as timely.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Strobe v. Collins, 315 F. App'x 57, 61 (10th Cir. 2009)
- Minter v. Prime Equip. Co., 451 F.3d 1196, 1205 n.4 (10th Cir. 2006)
- Colo. Visionary Acad. v. Medtronic, Inc., 194 F.R.D. 684, 687 (D. Colo. 2000)
- Summers v. Mo. Pac. R.R. Sys., 132 F.3d 599, 604 (10th Cir. 1997)
- Lehman Bros. Holdings Inc. v. Universal Am. Mortg. Co., LLC, 300 F.R.D. 678, 681 (D. Colo. 2014)
- Smith v. United States, 834 F.2d 166, 169 (10th Cir. 1987)
- Benton v. Avedon Eng'g, Inc., No. 10-cv-01899-RBJ-KLM, 2013 WL 1751886, at *1 (D. Colo. Apr. 23, 2013)
- Tesone v. Empire Marketing Strategies, 942 F.3d 979, 988 (10th Cir. 2019)
- Sinclair Wyo. Ref. Co. v. A & B Builders, Ltd., 989 F.3d 747, 783 (10th Cir. 2021)
- Morales-Fernandez v. INS, 418 F.3d 1116, 1119, 1122 (10th Cir. 2005)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-colorado-united-states-district-court-for-the-distr/2026/brian-holtsclaw-individually-and-for-others-similarly-61ag2340>