

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Brett Rapozo v. County of Sacramento

Rapozo · No. 2:25-cv-02881-DJC-CKD · Decided December 11, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a scheduling order in Brett Rapozo v. County of Sacramento, Case No. 2:25-cv-02881-DJC-CKD, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. It establishes deadlines for discovery, expert disclosures, dispositive motions, the final pretrial conference, and trial, and sets procedures for modifying the schedule. The order was signed by District Judge Daniel J. Calabretta on December 10, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02881-DJC-CKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court entered a scheduling order in a pending civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Requests to modify the scheduling order require a showing of good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b). Discovery rulings by the assigned magistrate judge are subject to modification by the district judge only if clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- pleadings
- joinder
- summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What case-management deadlines and procedures should govern discovery, motions, pretrial proceedings, and trial?
2. Under what circumstances may the parties amend the pleadings, join additional parties, or modify the scheduling order?
3. What procedures govern referral and review of discovery disputes?

HOLDINGS

1. No further joinder of parties or amendments to pleadings are permitted without leave of court and a showing of good cause.
2. Discovery disputes are referred to the assigned magistrate judge, whose written ruling is final subject to modification by the district judge only upon a showing that the ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
3. The scheduling order becomes final absent timely objections, and it may be modified only by leave of court upon a showing of good cause.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“No further joinder of parties or amendments to pleadings is permitted without leave of the Court, good cause having been shown.” (at 1)

“The written ruling of the assigned Magistrate Judge shall be final, subject to modification by the District Judge only where it has been shown that the Magistrate Judge’s order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” (at 2)

“This case schedule will become final without further order of the Court unless objections are filed within fourteen (14) days of the entry of this order.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The document provides no substantive facts concerning the underlying civil-rights claims. It identifies Brett Rapozo as plaintiff and Sacramento County as defendant and states that the case was at the scheduling stage.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending before the Eastern District of California when the court issued this scheduling order. The order established deadlines for discovery, dispositive motions, the final pretrial conference, and trial, and provided procedures for objections and modifications.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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

