

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Harville v. 7-Eleven, Inc.

No. 3:25-cv-01265-TWR-MSB (S.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2025) · No. 3:25-cv-01265-TWR-MSB · Decided August 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California granted the parties’ joint motion to continue deadlines concerning a forthcoming petition for approval of minors’ compromise. The Court ordered the petition to be filed by September 29, 2025, required submission of guardian ad litem documentation, and set a September 22, 2025 deadline for any consent to limited magistrate judge jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison H. Goddard
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	August 26, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-01265-TWR-MSB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiffs and defendants jointly moved to continue deadlines related to a forthcoming petition for approval of a minors' compromise.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Good cause is required to extend a deadline under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b), and the inquiry focuses on the diligence of the party seeking the extension and the reasons for modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential
PARTIES	Sharron Harville, A.C., a minor, by and through her guardian ad litem Dametrious Harville, A.P, a minor, by and through his guardian ad litem Dametrious Harville v. 7-Eleven, Inc., et al.

TOPICS

- guardianship procedure
- guardianships
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

guardianship procedure

guardianships

settlement approval

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties demonstrated good cause to extend the deadlines for filing a petition for approval of the minors' compromise.
2. What filing requirements and deadlines should govern the proposed minors' compromise petition.
3. Whether the parties were required to address appointment of guardians ad litem and potential consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties demonstrated good cause for a deadline extension because they were working diligently to finalize settlement details and prepare complete and accurate petitions.
2. The petition for approval of the minors' compromise must be filed by September 29, 2025, and must address the compromised claims, settlement terms and agreement, petitioner information, the parties' positions regarding fairness and the minors' best interests, and other information useful to the court's review.
3. A motion for appointment of a guardian ad litem, or a copy of any state-court order appointing a guardian ad litem, must be filed with the minors' compromise petition if no appointment is otherwise reflected on the docket.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Good cause" is a non-rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts." (at 1)

"[T]he focus of the inquiry is upon the moving party's reasons for seeking modification. ... If that party was not diligent, the inquiry should end." (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties were preparing a petition for approval of a settlement involving minor plaintiffs. They represented that they were diligently preparing the necessary documents but needed additional time to finalize settlement details and the structure of the payout to the minors. The court also found no indication on its docket that guardians ad litem had been appointed for the minor plaintiffs.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Southern District of California. The parties sought approximately 30 additional days to finalize settlement details and the structure of the minors' settlement payments before filing a petition for approval. The court granted the joint motion and established deadlines and filing requirements for the petition, any guardian ad litem appointment motion or state-court appointment order, and any consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Merck v. Swift Transp. Co., No. CV-16-01103-PHX-ROS, 2018 WL 4492362, at *2 (D. Ariz. Sept. 19, 2018)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-ca/2025/harville-v-7-eleven-inc-idny8xo0>