

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

John Ireland v. Flowserve Corp., Flowserve US Inc., and Does 1 to 10

Ireland · No. 2:24-CV-01663-DJC-JDP · Decided June 16, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated request and order in a federal civil case to extend the fact-discovery deadline. The court approved the parties’ first request and extended the deadline from its prior date to August 29, 2025, while leaving expert-discovery, motion, and trial deadlines unchanged.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
DECIDED	June 16, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-CV-01663-DJC-JDP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to extend the fact-discovery deadline by 59 days and sought modification of the scheduling order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), evaluated primarily by the diligence of the party seeking to modify the scheduling order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	John Ireland v. Flowserve Corp., Flowserve US Inc., Does 1 to 10

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure commercial litigation labor and employment

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order and extend the fact-discovery deadline.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties demonstrated good cause under Rule 16(b)(4) because they had diligently pursued discovery but could not reasonably complete the remaining fact-witness depositions by the existing deadline; the fact-discovery deadline was therefore extended to August 29, 2025.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the judge’s consent” (at 2)

“The key determination is whether the subject deadline “cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension.”” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties completed their Rule 26(f) conference, exchanged initial disclosures, and exchanged written discovery. Significant fact discovery remained, including depositions of the plaintiff, managers, key witnesses, and persons most qualified regarding defendants' electronically stored information. The parties represented that they had been diligent and needed additional time to complete fact-witness depositions, while not needing additional time for expert discovery.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was removed to federal court. The parties completed their Rule 26(f) conference, exchanged initial disclosures and written discovery, and sought additional time to conduct fact-witness depositions. The district court approved the stipulation and extended the fact-discovery deadline to August 29, 2025, while leaving expert-discovery and motion deadlines unchanged.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 608-09 (9th Cir. 1992)
- In re W. States Wholesale Nat. Gas Antitrust Litig., 715 F.3d 716, 737 (9th Cir. 2013)

OPINION

Ireland v. Flowserve Corp.

PER CURIAM.

1 JKaenveilnle P J.. LSeaeh o(Sutraiate (SBtaart eN Boa. r2 9N6o3. 4235)3 699) 2 JACKSON LEWIS P.C. 50 California Street, 9th Floor 3 San Francisco, California 94111-4615 Telephone: (415) 394-9400 4 Facsimile: (415) 394-9401 E-mail: Janelle.Sahouria@jacksonlewis.com 5 E-

mail: Kevin.Lee@jacksonlewis.com 6 Attorneys for Defendants FLOWSERVE CORP. and 7
FLOWSERVE US INC. 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

EASTERN DISTRICT

10 11 JOHN IRELAND, Case No. 2:24-CV-01663-DJC-JDP 12 Plaintiff,

13 STIPULATION AND ORDER TO

v. EXTEND DISCOVERY SCHEDULING

14 ORDER DEADLINES

FLOWSERVE CORP, FLOWSERVE US

15 INC. and Does 1 to 10, (FIRST REQUEST) 16 Defendants. Complaint Filed: 04/03/2024 17
Trial Date: 06/01/2026 18 Plaintiff John Ireland (“Plaintiff”), by and through his counsel of record
and Defendants 19 Flowserve Corporation and Flowserve US, Inc. (“Defendants”), by and through
their counsel of 20 record, hereby stipulate and agree to extend the unexpired discovery deadlines
for 59 days to 21 August 29, 2025. This is the parties’ first request for an extension of the
discovery deadline. 22

1. Discovery Completed to Date

23 To date, the parties have completed their FRCP 26(f) conference and have made exchanged 24
initial disclosures pursuant FRCP 26(a)(1). 25

2. Discovery Which Still Needs to Occur

26 The parties have exchanged written discovery, but significant discovery remains to be 27
completed in this matter. Plaintiff is seeking to depose key witnesses including managers and/or 28
1 well as the person(s) most qualified for ESI for Defendants. Defendants are seeking to depose 2
Plaintiff and other key witnesses, including but not limited to, those bearing upon Plaintiff’s
claims 3 and damages in this matter. The parties have been diligently attempting to resolve and
previously 4 agreed to engage in mediation with mediator Mark LeHocky. 5 The parties do not
anticipate needing additional time to identify and prepare expert 6 witnesses, exchange expert
reports, and conduct expert depositions. 7

3. Proposed Schedule for Completing Remaining Discovery

8 The parties propose extending the deadline to complete fact discovery to August 29, 2025. 9 All
other deadlines pertaining to expert discovery and motions shall remain the same per the 10
Court’s Scheduling Order. Trial is currently scheduled for June 1, 2026. 11

4. Good Cause Supports the Request to Extend the Deadline as Set Forth Herein

12 When a stipulation requires the modification of the scheduling order, the parties must first 13
satisfy the “good cause” standard established by Rule 16(b). See Johnson v. Mammoth 14
Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 608 (9th Cir. 1992); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4) (“A schedule
15 may be modified only for good cause and with the judge’s consent”). The good cause inquiry is
16 focused on the movant’s reasons for seeking to modify the scheduling order and primarily 17

considers the movant's diligence. In re W. States Wholesale Nat. Gas Antitrust Litig., 715 F.3d 18 716, 737 (9th Cir. 2013). The key determination is whether the subject deadline "cannot reasonably 19 be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." Johnson, 975 F.2d at 609. 20 Good cause supports the parties' request to extend the Fact Discovery deadline. The parties 21 have been diligent in pursuing discovery since the case's removal to federal court, including 22 holding their FRCP 26(f) conference, exchanging initial disclosures, and exchanging initial written 23 discovery. However, the parties need additional time to complete percipient witness depositions 24 in this matter. 25 By entering into this Stipulation, the Parties are not waiving any rights or objections they 26 may have regarding any other party's anticipated or actual discovery activities or conceding that 27 any such discovery is proper or necessary. Nonetheless, they are entering into this stipulation in 28 1 The Parties hereby stipulate to the aforementioned. 2 3 Dated: June 11, 2025

HENRY LACEY

4 By /s/ Stephen Henry

5 STEPHEN F. HENRY

Attorney for Plaintiff 6 7 8 9 Dated: June 13, 2025 JACKSON LEWIS P.C. 10 By: /s/ Kevin P. Lee Janelle J. Sahouria 11 Kevin P. Lee JACKSON LEWIS P.C. 12 Attorneys for Defendants FLOWSERVE CORP. and FLOWSERVE US INC. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1 ORDER

2 The parties deadline to complete fact discovery is hereby extended to August 29, 2025. All 3 other deadlines pertaining to expert discovery and motions shall remain the same per the Court's 4 Scheduling Order. 5 IT IS SO ORDERED: 6 7 Dated: June 13, 2025 /s/ Daniel J. Calabretta THE HONORABLE DANIEL J. CALABRETTA

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28