

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

L.V.Q. v. The GEO Group, Inc.

L.V.Q. · No. 1:24-cv-00656-KES-CDB · Decided August 13, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants the parties’ stipulated request to amend the scheduling order in L.V.Q. v. The GEO Group, Inc. The court finds limited good cause based on discovery disputes and ongoing ESI review, extends the case-management deadlines, and cautions that further extensions are unlikely absent extraordinary circumstances.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 13, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00656-KES-CDB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to amend the scheduling order and extend discovery, motion, pretrial, and trial deadlines. The district court granted the request in modified form.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), modification of a scheduling order requires good cause and the judge’s consent, with the primary consideration being the diligence of the party seeking modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district-court order; precedential status is unknown in the supplied metadata.
PARTIES	L.V.Q. v. The GEO Group, Inc.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties had shown good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order.
2. Whether the requested discovery, motion, pretrial, and trial deadlines should be extended based on the parties' discovery-dispute proceedings and Defendant's ongoing ESI review.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties did not establish good cause based on Defendant's unexplained delay in serving its first discovery requests because the record did not show that Defendant acted diligently in seeking discovery.
2. The court granted the stipulated request in modified form because the parties demonstrated limited good cause through their participation in the court's informal discovery-dispute procedures, Defendant's compliance with the discovery-dispute order, and Defendant's ongoing review of potentially responsive ESI.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b), a scheduling order “may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent.”” (at 2)

“Rule 16(b)’s ‘good cause’ standard primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment.” (at 2)

“Without further details, the Court cannot find that Defendant acted diligently in seeking discovery such that the scheduling order should be modified on this basis.” (at 3)

“In light of the parties’ representations and limited good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the scheduling order (Doc. 22) be amended as follows and as modified:” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties were engaged in discovery disputes concerning document production and electronically stored information, which the court had addressed through an informal discovery-dispute conference and a subsequent order. Defendant later produced documents covered by that order and began reviewing potentially responsive ESI, while also serving its first discovery requests on Plaintiff on August 7, 2025. The parties represented that discovery could not be completed by the existing deadlines and jointly sought extensions of the case-management schedule.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initiated the action on June 3, 2024, and later filed a first amended complaint asserting state-law causes of action. The court entered a scheduling order and later resolved discovery disputes involving document production and electronically stored information. The parties then requested extensions because discovery remained ongoing; the court found limited good cause and modified the case-management dates.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609-10 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002)

OPINION

L.V.Q. v. The GEO Group, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 L.V.Q., Case No. 1:24-cv-00656-KES-CDB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING PARTIES’

13 v. STIPULATED REQUEST TO AMEND

CASE MANAGEMENT DATES AS

14 THE GEO GROUP, INC., MODIFIED

15 Defendant. (Docs. 22, 51) 16 17 18 Relevant Background 19 Plaintiff L.V.Q. initiated this
action with the filing of a complaint on June 3, 2024. (Doc. 20 1). In the operative, first amended
complaint (“FAC”), Plaintiff asserts state law causes of action 21 against Defendant The GEO
Group, Inc. (“Defendant” or “GEO”). (Doc. 9). On October 24, 2024, 22 the Court entered the
operative scheduling order setting forth discovery, motion and pretrial and 23 trial dates and
deadlines. (Doc. 22). 24 On July 10, 2024, following submission by the parties of a joint letter
brief and the Court’s 25 convening with the parties for an informal discovery dispute conference,
the Court entered an order 26 resolving certain discovery disputes over Defendant’s objections to
and withholding of documents 27 responsive to Plaintiff’s requests for production of documents,
and separate disputes pertaining to 28 Defendant’s production of electronically stored information
(“ESI”). (Doc. 34). 1 Pending before the Court is the parties’ stipulated request to amend the
scheduling order. 2 (Doc. 51). The parties represent that good cause exists to continue case
management dates to allow 3 more time for discovery as Defendant has since produced documents
subject to the Court’s order 4 resolving the parties’ discovery disputes and has run searches for
other ESI responsive to Plaintiff’s 5 discovery requests. Id. at 2. The parties represent Defendant’s
counsel has notified Plaintiff’s 6 counsel that review of potentially responsive ESI is underway. Id.
(citing Ex. A, Decl. of Jessica 7 Zhang (“Zhang Decl.”)). The parties represent that Defendant has
served its first set of discovery 8 requests on Plaintiff on August 7, 2025. Id. The parties represent
that they are working in good 9 faith and diligently to respond to all pending discovery requests
but will not be able to complete 10 discovery by the current deadline of September 24, 2025, for
completion of non-expert discovery. 11 Id. The parties therefore jointly request to continue the

deadlines in this case to allow for the 12 completion of discovery as set forth in their stipulation (see *id.* at 2-3): 13 Event Prior Date Amended Date 14 Mid-Discovery Status Conference 08/20/2025 11/05/2025, 9:30 AM 15 Non-Expert Discovery Deadline 09/24/2025 12/12/2025 16 Expert Disclosure Deadline 10/24/2025 01/12/2026 17 Rebuttal Disclosure Deadline 11/24/2025 02/12/2026 18 Expert Discovery Deadline 12/24/2025 03/12/2026 19 Non-Dispositive Motion Filing 01/08/2026 04/08/2026 20 Non-Dispositive Motion Hearing 02/16/2026 05/13/2026 21 Dispositive Motion Filing 03/16/2026 06/16/2026 22 Dispositive Motion Hearing 04/27/2026 07/27/2026, 1:30 PM 23 Pre-Trial Conference 08/24/2026 11/23/2026, 1:30 PM 24 Trial Date 10/20/2026 01/26/2027, 8:30 AM 25 Standard of Law 26 District courts enter scheduling orders in actions to “limit the time to join other parties, 27 amend the pleadings, complete discovery, and file motions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(3). Once 28 entered, a scheduling order “controls the course of the action unless the court modifies it.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(d). Scheduling orders are intended to alleviate case management problems. *Johnson v. 2 Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 610 (9th Cir. 1992). 3 “A scheduling order is not a frivolous piece of paper, idly entered, which can be cavalierly 4 disregarded by counsel without peril.” *Id.* (quotation and citation omitted). Under Federal Rule 5 of Civil Procedure 16(b), a scheduling order “may be modified only for good cause and with the 6 judge's consent.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4)/ “Rule 16(b)’s ‘good cause’ standard primarily 7 considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment.” *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609. If the 8 moving party is unable to reasonably meet a deadline despite acting diligently, the scheduling 9 order may be modified. *Id.* If, however, the moving party “‘was not diligent, the inquiry should 10 end’ and the motion to modify should not be granted.” *Zivkovic v. So. Cal. Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d 11 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Johnson*, 975 F.2d at 609). 12 Discussion 13 Here, the Court does not find good cause to grant the requested extension based on the 14 parties’ representation that Defendant served its first set of discovery requests on Plaintiff on

15 August 7, 2025. It is unclear from the parties’ filings why Defendant waited ten months from the

16 date discovery was opened, and only six weeks before nonexpert discovery is set to close, to 17 propound its first set of discovery requests on Plaintiff. Without further details, the Court cannot 18 find that Defendant acted diligently in seeking discovery such that the scheduling order should be 19 modified on this basis. See *Johnson*, 965 F.2d at 609. 20 Notwithstanding Defendant’s unexplained delay in seeking discovery, the Court finds the 21 parties have demonstrated limited good cause for the requested extension of all case management 22 dates based on the parties’ engagement in the Court’s informal discovery dispute procedures (Docs. 23 30, 32, 33) and Defendant’s compliance with the Court’s order resolving the discovery dispute 24 (Doc. 34), including Defendant’s ongoing review of potentially responsive ESI. 25 Given the parties’ showing of limited good cause and the generous extension granted 26 herein, the Court is unlikely to grant further requests for extension of case management dates 27 absent a showing of

extraordinary circumstances beyond good cause. 28 /// 1 Conclusion and Order 2 In light of the parties' representations and limited good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY 3 | ORDERED that the scheduling order (Doc. 22) be amended as follows and as modified: 4 Event Prior Date Amended Date 5 Mid-Discovery Status Conference 08/20/2025 11/05/2025, 10:00 AM 6 Non-Expert Discovery Deadline 09/24/2025 12/12/2025 7 Expert Disclosure Deadline 10/24/2025 01/12/2026 8 Rebuttal Disclosure Deadline 11/24/2025 02/12/2026 9 Expert Discovery Deadline 12/24/2025 03/12/2026 10 Non-Dispositive Motion Filing 01/08/2026 04/08/2026 11 Non-Dispositive Motion Hearing 02/16/2026 05/13/2026 12 Dispositive Motion Filing 03/16/2026 06/16/2026 13 Dispositive Motion Hearing 04/27/2026 08/03/2026, 1:30 PM 14 Pre-Trial Conference 08/24/2026 12/14/2026, 1:30 PM 15 Trial Date 10/20/2026 02/09/2027, 8:30 AM 16 | IP 1S SO ORDERED. 17 Dated: _ August 13, 2025 | Word bo 18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28