

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)