

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bright People Foods dba Dr. McDougall’s Right Foods v. Alliance
Sales & Marketing MW, Inc. and Does 1 to 20

Bright People Foods · No. 2:24-cv-00060 WBS AC · Decided December 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants defendants’ motion to modify the scheduling order based on a finding of sufficient diligence and good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4). The order extends expert disclosure, discovery, motion, final pretrial conference, and jury trial deadlines, while leaving all other provisions unchanged.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William B. Shubb
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 9, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-00060 WBS AC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order by extending expert-disclosure, discovery, motion, pretrial-conference, and trial deadlines.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), a scheduling order may be modified only for good cause, with the inquiry focusing primarily on the diligence of the party seeking modification; prejudice to the opposing party may provide an additional reason to deny modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants demonstrated sufficient diligence and good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to warrant modification of the scheduling order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) allows the court to modify its scheduling order for good cause.”
(1)

“The “good cause” standard focuses primarily on the diligence of the party seeking the amendment.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants requested extensions of various scheduling-order deadlines, asserting that plaintiff's counsel had refused to provide availability for outstanding depositions. Plaintiff opposed the modifications, stating that plaintiff's counsel had been unavailable on the dates defendants proposed. The court determined that defendants had been sufficiently diligent to establish good cause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the Eastern District of California under a previously entered scheduling order. Defendants sought modification because of difficulties coordinating outstanding depositions, and plaintiff opposed the requested changes. The court found defendants sufficiently diligent, granted the motion, and modified specified scheduling-order deadlines while leaving all other provisions unchanged.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.3d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)

OPINION

Bright People Foods dba Dr. McDougall's Right Foods v. Alliance Sales & Marketing MW, Inc.
and Does 1 to 20

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 ----oo0oo---- 11 12

BRIGHT PEOPLE FOODS DBA DR. No. 2:24-cv-00060 WBS AC

13 MCDUGALL'S RIGHT FOODS,

14 Plaintiff,

ORDER RE: MODIFICATION OF

15 vs. SCHEDULING ORDER

16 ALLIANCE SALES & MARKETING MW,

INC., and DOES 1 TO 20, 17 Defendants. 18

R & M INNOVATIONS LLC,

19 Plaintiff, 20 vs. 21

ALLIANCE SALES & MARKETING MW,

22 INC., and DOES 1 TO 20, 23 Defendants. 24 ----oo0oo---- 25 Before the court is defendants'

motion to modify the 26 Scheduling Order. (Docket No. 38.) Federal Rule of Civil 27 Procedure

16(b)(4) allows the court to modify its scheduling 28 1 order for good cause. The "good cause"

standard focuses 2 primarily on the diligence of the party seeking the amendment. 3 Johnson v.

Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.3d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 4 1992). "Although the existence or

degree of prejudice to the 5 party opposing the modification might supply additional reasons 6 to

deny a motion, the focus of the inquiry is upon the moving 7 party's reasons for seeking

modification." Id. 8 Defendants' counsel requests extensions of various 9 dates in the Scheduling

Order (Docket No. 16) on the grounds that 10 plaintiff's counsel has refused to provide

availability for 11 outstanding depositions. (See Docket No. 38 at 2-5.) 12 Plaintiff's counsel

opposes these modifications to the Scheduling 13 Order because they were unavailable to conduct

depositions on the 14 dates defendants' counsel requested to conduct them. (See Docket 15 No. 42

at 2-3.) 16 Defendants appear to have been sufficiently diligent to 17 support a finding of good

cause to modify the current Scheduling 18 Order. Accordingly, the Scheduling Order is modified

in the 19 following manner: 20

1. Section IV of the Scheduling Order is modified in the

21 following manner: 22 a. The parties shall disclose experts and produce 23 reports in accordance

with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 26(a)(2) no later than December 19, 2025. 25 b. With

regard to expert testimony intended solely 26 for purposes of rebuttal, those experts shall be

disclosed and 27 reports produced in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil 28

Procedure 26(a) (2) on or before January 29, 2026. 2 Cc. All discovery, including depositions for 3

preservation of testimony, is left open, save and except that it 4 shall be conducted as to be

completed by February 26, 2026. All 5 motions to compel discovery must be noticed on the

magistrate 6 judge's calendar in accordance with the local rules of this Court 7 and so that such

motions may be heard (and any resulting orders 8 obeyed) not later than February 26, 2026. 9

2. Section V of the Scheduling Order is modified in the

10 following manner: 11 a. All motions, except motions in limine, motions for 12 continuances,
temporary restraining orders, or other emergency 13 applications shall be filed on or before March
12, 2026. 14

3. Section VI of the Scheduling Order is modified in the

15 following manner: 16 a. The Final Pretrial Conference is set for May 18, 17 2026 at 1:30 p.m.

18 4, Section VII of the Scheduling Order is modified in the 19 following manner: 20 a. The jury
trial is set for September 1, 2026 at 21 9:00 a.m. 22

5. All other matters discussed in the May 29, 2024

23 Scheduling Order shall remain unchanged. 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 , . Dated: December 8,
2025 tleom ah. A. be—~

26 WILLIAM B. SHUBB

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2 8