

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Gonzalez v. Amazon.com Services, LLC

No. 1:24-cv-00325-KES-CDB, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (March 21, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted in part the parties’ stipulated request to continue scheduling deadlines in Gonzalez v. Amazon.com Services, LLC. The court amended the scheduling order, continued the mid-discovery status conference and motion deadlines, and vacated the previously scheduled conference date, while warning that further extensions were unlikely absent extraordinary circumstances.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 21, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00325-KES-CDB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly requested a continuance of case-management deadlines and amendment of the scheduling order while they pursued informal settlement discussions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Good cause under the governing scheduling order and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) was required to modify the deadlines; the court exercised its discretion to determine the appropriate length of any continuance.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court scheduling order

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties demonstrated good cause for a 90-day continuance of the scheduling-order deadlines.
2. Whether the court should amend the scheduling order and continue the related status-conference, motion-filing, and motion-hearing dates.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties did not demonstrate good cause for the requested 90-day continuance, but the circumstances warranted a shorter 45-day extension.
2. The scheduling order was amended to extend the specified discovery, disclosure, motion, pretrial, and trial deadlines by approximately 45 days, and the mid-discovery status conference and motion hearings were continued.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In these days of heavy caseloads, trial courts in both the federal and state systems routinely set schedules and establish deadlines to foster efficient treatment and resolution of cases. Those efforts will be successful only if the deadlines are taken seriously by the parties, and the best way to encourage that is to enforce the strictly with scheduling and other orders” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

After the case was filed, counsel for both Plaintiff and Defendant changed, requiring new counsel to familiarize themselves with the matter. The parties were engaged in informal settlement negotiations and agreed to conserve discovery resources while pursuing those discussions. They had already exchanged initial disclosures, documents, and written discovery.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Eastern District of California under a scheduling order. After counsel for both parties changed and the parties exchanged initial disclosures and discovery, they submitted a stipulated request to extend deadlines by 90 days. The court found good cause for only a 45-day extension, amended the scheduling order accordingly, and vacated or continued related status-conference and motion-hearing dates.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Wong v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.*, 410 F.3d 1052, 1060 (9th Cir. 2005)