

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Amy Gile ex rel. minor A.G. v. Town of Windham, et al.

Gile · No. 3:24-cv-01635 (VDO) · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut denies Amy Gile’s motion to modify the scheduling order in her action concerning alleged peer-to-peer racial discrimination against her child. The court finds that Gile failed to demonstrate the diligence and good cause required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 to extend deadlines for amending pleadings, expert disclosures, discovery, and dispositive motions. The ruling emphasizes the parties’ repeated noncompliance with court-ordered deadlines and the plaintiff’s failure to pursue discovery or seek timely extensions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Thomas O. Farrish
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-cv-01635 (VDO)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 to modify the scheduling order after the deadlines for pleading amendments, expert disclosures, discovery, and initiating dispositive-motion practice had passed. The motion was referred by the presiding district judge to the magistrate judge for resolution as a nondispositive motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A magistrate judge's ruling on a nondispositive motion is reviewable under the clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court ruling; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Amy Gile ex rel. minor A.G. v. Town of Windham, Windham Public Schools, Charles H. Barrows Stem Academy, Tim Maclure, Stephanie Sawyer, Tracy Youngberg

TOPICS

motion to amend

discovery dispute

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

municipal law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the deadline for amending the pleadings.
2. Whether plaintiff established good cause under Rule 16(b)(4) to extend the expert-disclosure, discovery-completion, and dispositive-motion deadlines.
3. How the Rule 16 good-cause standard interacts with the liberal amendment policy of Rule 15(a)(2) when a motion to amend is filed after the scheduling-order deadline.

HOLDINGS

1. A party seeking to amend a pleading after the deadline in a scheduling order must satisfy Rule 16(b)(4)'s good-cause requirement, and diligence by the moving party is the primary consideration. Plaintiff failed to establish good cause because she knew from the outset that constitutional claims were available, knew of the alleged emotional distress before the amendment deadline, and did not diligently investigate or pursue the proposed claim.
2. A party seeking to extend expert-disclosure, discovery, or dispositive-motion deadlines under Rule 16(b)(4) must make a particularized showing that the schedule could not reasonably be met despite diligence and for reasons not reasonably foreseeable when the schedule was adopted. Plaintiff failed to make that showing.
3. The ruling on plaintiff's motion to modify the scheduling order is a nondispositive ruling by a magistrate judge and is reviewable under the clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As the Second Circuit has instructed, “the primary consideration” in deciding whether to amend a scheduling order to allow late pleading amendments “is whether the moving party can demonstrate diligence.”” (at 9)

“Under Rule 16, the Court must set deadlines to “complete discovery, and file motions.” Once these deadlines are set, they can be modified “only for good cause and with the judge’s consent.”” (at 11)

“For the foregoing reasons, the motion of the plaintiff, Amy Gile ex rel. minor A.G., to modify the scheduling order is DENIED.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that her minor child, a Black biracial student, experienced peer-to-peer racial discrimination at a Connecticut public school and that school officials were deliberately indifferent. The court's scheduling order provided more than a year for discovery, but the parties conducted virtually no discovery until shortly before the

deadlines and failed to comply with multiple status-report and scheduling-order requirements. Plaintiff sought to add a Section 1983 equal-protection claim and extend expert-disclosure, discovery, and dispositive-motion deadlines after the relevant deadlines had expired.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed suit on October 11, 2024, and amended her complaint five days later. The court entered a scheduling order setting deadlines for amendments, discovery, expert disclosures, and dispositive motions. After the court dismissed several claims on January 27, 2026, and sanctioned counsel for repeated scheduling-order violations, plaintiff moved to extend the deadlines. The court denied the motion, concluding that plaintiff had not shown the diligence and good cause required by Rule 16.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Fresh Del Monte Produce, Inc. v. Del Monte Foods, Inc., 304 F.R.D. 170, 174 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)
- Bilt-Rite Steel Buck Corp. v. Duncan's Welding & Corr. Equip., Inc., No. 90-cv-311 (TCO), 1990 WL 129970, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 24, 1990)
- Ruotolo v. City of N.Y., 514 F.3d 184, 191 (2d Cir. 2008)
- McCarthy v. Dun & Bradstreet Corp., 482 F.3d 184, 200-01 (2d Cir. 2007)
- Pal v. Cipolla, No. 3:18-cv-00616 (MPS) (TOF), 2020 WL 564230, at *3 (D. Conn. Feb. 5, 2020)
- This, LLC v. Jaccard Corp., No. 3:15-cv-01606 (JBA), 2016 WL 11582700, at *1 (D. Conn. Nov. 30, 2016)
- Parker v. Columbia Pictures Indus., 204 F.3d 326, 339-40 (2d Cir. 2000)
- Grochowski v. Phoenix Constr., 318 F.3d 80, 86 (2d Cir. 2003)
- Kassner v. 2nd Ave. Delicatessen, Inc., 496 F.3d 229, 244 (2d Cir. 2007)
- Presbyterian Church of Sudan v. Talisman Energy, Inc., 582 F.3d 244, 267 (2d Cir. 2009)
- Holmes v. Grubman, 568 F.3d 329, 335 (2d Cir. 2009)
- Hui Wang v. Omni Hotels Mgmt. Corp., No. 3:18-cv-2000 (VDO), 2025 WL 1782264, at *8 (D. Conn. June 27, 2025)
- Soroof Trading Dev. Co., Ltd. v. GE Microgen, Inc., 283 F.R.D. 142, 152 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)
- Block v. First Blood Assoc., 988 F.2d 344, 350 (2d Cir. 1993)
- Levin v. Credit Suisse Inc., 577 F. App'x 85, 86 (2d Cir. 2014)
- Conservation L. Found. v. All-Star Transp., No. 3:21-cv-201 (JBA) (TOF), 2022 WL 16706958, at *5 (D. Conn. Nov. 4, 2022)
- Karazin v. Wright Med. Tech., No. 3:17-cv-823 (JBA), 2018 WL 6067235, at *1-2 (D. Conn. Nov. 19, 2018)
- Harnage v. Brennan, No. 3:16-cv-1659 (AWT) (SALM), 2018 WL 2128379, at *4 (D. Conn. May 9, 2018)
- Shemendera v. First Niagara Bank, N.A., 288 F.R.D. 251, 253 (W.D.N.Y. 2012)

- Casagrande v. Norm Bloom & Son, LLC, No. 3:11-cv-1918 (CSH), 2014 WL 5817562, at *2 (D. Conn. Nov. 10, 2014)
- Jeannite v. City of New York Dep't of Bldgs., No. 09-cv-3464 (DAB) (KNF), 2010 WL 2542050, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. June 21, 2010)
- Woodworth v. Erie Ins. Co., No. 05-cv-6344 (CJS), 2009 WL 3671930, at *3 (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 29, 2009)
- Baburam v. Fed. Express Corp., 318 F.R.D. 5, 8 (E.D.N.Y. 2016)
- Carlson v. Geneva City Sch. Dist., 277 F.R.D. 90, 95 (W.D.N.Y. 2011)
- Rivers v. N.Y.C. Hous. Auth., No. 11-cv-5065 (KAM) (MDG), 2014 WL 12829494, at *3 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 17, 2014)
- Fielding v. Tollaksen, 510 F.3d 175, 178 (2d Cir. 2007)
- Kilcullen v. N.Y. State Dep't of Transp., 55 F. App'x 583, 584 (2d Cir. 2003)
- Gutierrez v. Miller, No. 1:17-cv-09570 (PGG) (SDA), 2019 WL 13162439, at *17 n.20 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 17, 2019)
- Sokol Holdings, Inc. v. BMB Munai, Inc., No. 05-cv-3749 (KMW) (DCF), 2009 WL 3467756, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 28, 2009)