

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Mary Ann Margaret Anderson v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., et al.

Anderson · No. 2:25-cv-01916-DJC-CSK · Decided November 26, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a scheduling order in Anderson v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., et al., pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. It establishes discovery, motion, pretrial, and trial deadlines, including a June 7, 2027 jury trial, and is signed by District Judge Daniel J. Calabretta.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
DECIDED	November 26, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01916-DJC-CSK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court entered a scheduling order governing service, joinder and amendment, discovery, motion practice, pretrial proceedings, and trial.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A magistrate judge's written ruling on referred discovery matters is subject to modification by the district judge only if it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential case-management order

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- joinder
- motion to amend

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What procedures and deadlines should govern service, joinder, amendment of pleadings, discovery, dispositive motions, pretrial proceedings, and trial?

2. What standard governs district-court review of referred discovery rulings by the assigned magistrate judge?
3. What showing and court approval are required to modify the scheduling order?

HOLDINGS

1. Further service, joinder of parties, or amendments to pleadings are not permitted without leave of court and a showing of good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b).
2. A written ruling by the assigned magistrate judge on referred discovery matters may be modified by the district judge only upon a showing that the ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
3. The scheduling order may be modified only by leave of court upon a showing of good cause; party stipulation alone is ineffective without court approval.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The schedule, once final, shall not be modified except by leave of the Court upon showing of good cause.”
(at 7)

“Agreement of the parties by stipulation alone does not constitute good cause.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The named defendants had been served, and the action was proceeding in the Eastern District of California. The court set deadlines for fact and expert discovery, dispositive motions, the final pretrial conference, and a jury trial. The order also established procedures for discovery disputes, amendments, joinder, and requests to modify the schedule.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending before the Eastern District of California, and the court entered a scheduling order after service of the named defendants. The order established discovery, dispositive-motion, pretrial, and trial deadlines and prescribed procedures for modifying the schedule.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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