

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Daniel Aragon v. Experian Information Solutions, Inc.

Aragon · No. 3:25-cv-0814-BAS-SBC · Decided January 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California partially granted and partially denied Experian Information Solutions, Inc.’s motion to continue an Early Neutral Evaluation and stay proceedings. The Court continued the ENE to February 26, 2026, but declined to stay the case in its entirety because Defendant had not shown that resolution of related small-claims cases was required before the federal action could proceed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	January 27, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-0814-BAS-SBC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to continue a scheduled Early Neutral Evaluation and stay the proceedings. The court granted the motion in part by continuing the ENE and denied it in part by declining to stay the entire case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied a good-cause standard and recognized that determining good cause for extending a deadline is within the court's broad discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; generally nonprecedential.
PARTIES	Daniel Aragon v. Experian Information Solutions, Inc.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- mediation
- credit reporting

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- consumer protection

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendant demonstrated good cause to continue the scheduled Early Neutral Evaluation.
2. Whether the related small-claims actions justified staying the federal proceedings in their entirety.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendant demonstrated good cause for a continuance, but a thirty-day continuance rather than the requested minimum sixty-day continuance was appropriate.
2. The related small-claims actions did not justify staying the federal proceedings in their entirety.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Parties seeking to continue an ENE must demonstrate good cause.” (at 1)

“Defendant has not shown that this case is so dependent on the outcome of the Small Claims cases such that this matter must be stayed until those cases are completely resolved.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant represented that Plaintiff had filed two related lawsuits against Experian in the San Diego Superior Court, Small Claims Division, in addition to this federal action. One small-claims matter had a hearing scheduled for January 28, 2026, and another had a settlement deadline of February 15, 2026. The court found that the claims in the three cases were intertwined and that proceeding with the ENE immediately could affect the parties' conduct, but it did not find the federal case dependent enough on the small-claims outcomes to justify a complete stay.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the Southern District of California with an Early Neutral Evaluation scheduled for January 28, 2026. Defendant moved for a continuance of at least sixty days and a stay based on related small-claims actions involving the parties. Plaintiff opposed the motion. The court continued the ENE for thirty days but denied a stay of the proceedings.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 607 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Olvera v. Citibank, N.A., No. 25-cv-789-H-AHG, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117769, at *2, *4-*5 (S.D. Cal. June 19, 2025)
- Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010)

OPINION

Aragon

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 DANIEL ARAGON, Case No.: 3:25-cv-0814-BAS-SBC 12 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND

13 v. DENYING IN PART MOTION TO

CONTINUE ENE AND STAY

14 EXPERIAN INFORMATION

PROCEEDINGS

SOLUTIONS, INC.,

15 Defendant. [Dkt. No. 25] 16 Before the Court is Defendant's January 21, 2026, Motion to
Continue Early Neutral 17 Evaluation and Stay Proceedings (hereafter "Motion") (Dkt. No. 25)
and Plaintiff's 18 Response in Opposition (hereafter "Opposition") (Dkt. No. 26). The Motion
seeks to 19 continue the Early Neutral Evaluation ("ENE") currently set for January 28, 2026, at
10:00 20 AM before United States Magistrate Judge Steve B. Chu. (See Dkt. No. 22). After duly
21 considering the submissions, the Motion is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN 22 PART for
the reasons set forth below. 23 Parties seeking to continue an ENE must demonstrate good cause.
(Dkt. No. 22 at 3- 24 4 (Counsel must file a motion "setting forth good cause for the request"); see
Fed. R. Civ. 25 P. 6(b) ("[w]hen an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may,
for 26 good cause, extend the time"). Courts have broad discretion in determining whether there
27 is good cause. See, e.g., *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 607 (9th Cir. 28
1 1992); *Olvera v. Citibank, N.A.*, No. 25-cv-789-H-AHG, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117769, 2 at
*2, *4-*5 (S.D. Cal. June 19, 2025). "Good cause" is a non-rigorous standard that has 3 been
construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts. *Ahanchian v. Xenon 4 Pictures, Inc.*,
624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010). 5 Here, Defendant represents to the Court that this case is one
of three active lawsuits 6 filed by Plaintiff against Experian with the other two pending in the San
Diego Superior 7 Court, Small Claims Division (Dkt. No. 25 at 1). Defendant argues that the
"allegations in 8 Small Claims Case 0269 are nearly identical to those in this present lawsuit"
(Dkt. No. 25 9 at 2) and that requiring the parties to participate in an ENE would "prejudice the
parties as 10 it would potentially result in conflicting outcomes regarding the same accounts and
11 claims." (Dkt. No. 25 at 2). As such, Defendant requests a continuance of the ENE by at 12
least sixty-days (Dkt. No. 25 at 1). 13 In light of Defendant's claims, the Court finds a thirty-day
continuance is prudent. 14 The Small Claims Case 4553 has a hearing on January 28, 2026 (Dkt.
No. 25 at 3) and the 15 Small Claims Case 0269 has a settlement deadline of February 15, 2026,
(Dkt. No. 25 at 16 2). The Court finds it an efficient use of judicial resources to continue the ENE
until after 17 these Small Claims cases have progressed. Defendant has demonstrated good cause

that 18 the claims of all three cases are intertwined and would affect how the parties act at the 19 ENE. While Plaintiff opposes the continuance stating that proceeding with the ENE creates 20 no inefficiency or prejudice (Dkt. No. 26 at 7), the Court finds that a thirty-day continuance 21 strikes the right balance between using judicial resources efficiency with the need to hold 22 an ENE early in a case. 23 However, the Court does not find reason to stay the proceedings in its entirety. 24 Defendant has not shown that this case is so dependent on the outcome of the Small Claims 25 cases such that this matter must be stayed until those cases are completely resolved. 26 /// 27 /// 28 /// 1 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART Defendant's 2 ||Motion to Continue the ENE and Stay Proceedings. The Court continues the ENE until 3 February 26, 2026, at 02:00 PM. If the case does not settle, the Court will move into the 4 ||Case Management Conference at that time. The parties must comply with all of the 5 ||requirements set forth in the Court's December 02, 2025, Notice and Order for Early 6 || Neutral Evaluation Conference and Case Management Conference. (Dkt. No. 22) prior to 7 || that ENE. 8 IT IS SO ORDERED. 9 || Dated: January 27, 2026 10 United States Magistrate Judge 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28