

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rieux v. Union Pacific Railroad Company

Rieux · No. 2:25-cv-317 WBS SCR · Decided August 5, 2025

SUMMARY

This is a Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Order issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California in Randy Rieux v. Union Pacific Railroad Company. The order sets deadlines for disclosures, expert reports, discovery, motions, the final pretrial conference, and a jury trial in an Americans with Disabilities Act employment-discrimination action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William B. Shubb
DECIDED	August 5, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-317 WBS SCR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued a status and pretrial scheduling order after reviewing the parties' joint status report and vacated the scheduled status conference.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Randy Rieux v. Union Pacific Railroad Company

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- service of process
- joinder
- ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law
- civil rights
- disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should vacate the scheduled status conference and enter a pretrial scheduling order.
- Whether the court should establish deadlines and conditions governing service, joinder, amendments, discovery, expert disclosures, motions, pretrial proceedings, trial, and settlement.

HOLDINGS

- 1. No further service, joinder of parties, or amendments to pleadings are permitted without leave of court and a showing of good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b).
- 2. Federal-question jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the action asserts claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and venue is proper.
- 3. The parties must comply with the deadlines and procedures established for initial disclosures, expert disclosures, completion of discovery, motions, the final pretrial conference, trial, and potential settlement proceedings.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act against his former employer. The parties reported that all defendants had been served, that venue was undisputed, and that the case required discovery, expert disclosures, motion practice, pretrial proceedings, and a jury trial. The parties also indicated that alternative dispute resolution was appropriate.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Randy Rieux filed an Americans with Disabilities Act disability-discrimination action against his former employer, Union Pacific Railroad Company. After service of process and submission of the parties' joint status report, the court vacated the August 11, 2025, status conference and entered scheduling, discovery, motion, pretrial, trial, and settlement directives.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 607-10 (9th Cir. 1992)

OPINION

Rieux v. Union Pacific Railroad Company
PER CURIAM.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 ----oo0oo---- 11
12 RANDY RIEUX, No. 2:25-cv-317 WBS SCR
13 Plaintiff, 14 v.
15 UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD
COMPANY,

16 Defendant. 17

18 ----oo0oo---- 19

20 STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) ORDER

21 After reviewing the parties' Joint Status Report 22 (Docket No. 19), the court hereby vacates the Status (Pretrial 23 Scheduling) Conference scheduled for August 11, 2025, and makes 24 the following findings and orders without needing to consult with 25 the parties any further.

26 I. SERVICE OF PROCESS

27 All defendants have been served, and no further service 28 is permitted without leave of court, good cause having been shown 1 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b).

2 II. JOINDER OF PARTIES/AMENDMENTS

3 No further joinder of parties or amendments to 4 pleadings will be permitted except with leave of court, good 5 cause having been shown under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6 16(b). See Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 7 607-10 (9th Cir. 1992).

8 III. JURISDICTION/VENUE

9 Jurisdiction is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 10 because plaintiff brings claims under the Americans with 11 Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12112, in this disability 12 discrimination action against his former employer. Venue is 13 undisputed and hereby found to be proper.

14 IV. DISCOVERY

15 The parties agree to serve the initial disclosures 16 required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1) on or before

17 August 4, 2025.

18 The parties shall disclose experts and produce reports 19 in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2) by no 20 later than June 26, 2026. With regard to expert testimony 21 intended solely for rebuttal, those experts shall be disclosed 22 and reports produced in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil

23 Procedure 26(a)(2) on or before July 28, 2026.

24 All discovery, including depositions for preservation 25 of testimony, is left open, save and except that it shall be so 26 conducted as to be completed by August 28, 2026. The word 27 "completed" means that all discovery shall have been conducted so 28 that all depositions have been taken and any disputes relevant to 1 discovery shall have been resolved by appropriate order if 2 necessary and, where discovery has been ordered, the order has 3 been obeyed. All motions to compel discovery must be noticed on 4 the magistrate judge's calendar in accordance with the local 5 rules of this court and so that such motions may be heard (and 6 any resulting orders obeyed) not later than August 28, 2026.

7 V. MOTION HEARING SCHEDULE

8 All motions, except motions for continuances, temporary 9 restraining orders, or other emergency applications, shall be 10 filed on or before October 28, 2026. All motions shall be 11 noticed for the next available hearing date. Counsel are 12 cautioned to refer to the local rules

regarding the requirements 13 for noticing and opposing such motions on the court's regularly 14 scheduled law and motion calendar.

15 VI. FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE

16 The Final Pretrial Conference is set for January 11, 17 2027, at 1:30 p.m. in Courtroom No. 5. The conference shall be 18 attended by at least one of the attorneys who will conduct the 19 trial for each of the parties and by any unrepresented parties. 20 Counsel for all parties are to be fully prepared for 21 trial at the time of the Pretrial Conference, with no matters 22 remaining to be accomplished except production of witnesses for 23 oral testimony. Counsel shall file separate pretrial statements 24 and are referred to Local Rules 281 and 282 relating to the 25 contents of and time for filing those statements. In addition to 26 those subjects listed in Local Rule 281(b), the parties are to 27 provide the court with: (1) a plain, concise statement which 28 identifies every non-discovery motion which has been made to the 1 court, and its resolution; (2) a list of the remaining claims as 2 against each defendant; and (3) the estimated number of trial 3 days. 4 In providing the plain, concise statements of 5 undisputed facts and disputed factual issues contemplated by 6 Local Rule 281(b)(3)-(4), the parties shall emphasize the claims 7 that remain at issue, and any remaining affirmatively pled 8 defenses thereto. If the case is to be tried to a jury, the 9 parties shall also prepare a succinct statement of the case, 10 which is appropriate for the court to read to the jury.

11 VII. TRIAL SETTING

12 The jury trial is set for March 16, 2027, at 9:00 a.m. 13 The parties estimate that the trial will last five (5) days.

14 VIII. SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

15 The parties believe that alternative dispute resolution 16 is appropriate and will continue to confer regarding the use of a 17 private mediator or the voluntary dispute resolution program. If 18 private efforts to settle fail, a Settlement Conference with a 19 magistrate judge will be set at the time of the Pretrial 20 Conference. Counsel are instructed to have a principal with full 21 settlement authority present at the Settlement Conference or to 22 be fully authorized to settle the matter on any terms. At least 23 seven calendar days before the Settlement Conference counsel for 24 each party shall submit a confidential Settlement Conference 25 Statement for review by the settlement judge. The Settlement 26 Conference Statements shall not be filed and will not otherwise 27 be disclosed to the trial judge.

28 IX. MODIFICATIONS TO SCHEDULING ORDER

ee nn RENEE EI IIE 1 Any requests to modify the dates or terms of this 2 Scheduling Order, except requests to change the date of the 3 trial, may be heard and decided by the assigned Magistrate Judge. 4 All requests to change the trial date shall be heard and decided 5 only by the undersigned judge. 6 IT IS SO ORDERED. 7 Dated: August 4, 2025 at the A, A. ☐ ☐ ☐

9 WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california/2025/rieux-v-union-pacific-railroad-company-d7lll1k0>