

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO DIVISION

Joseph Amey, as an individual, and Warren Amey, as an individual v.
Andrew Patterson, as an individual, Andrew Falvey, as an individual,
Najee Burge, as an individual, and County of Sacramento, as a
municipal corporation

Amey · No. 2:24-CV-02232-TLN-CSK · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The parties stipulate to, and the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders, a 90-day modification of the scheduling deadlines in Joseph Amey and Warren Amey v. Andrew Patterson, et al. The order extends fact discovery to April 14, 2026, expert disclosures to May 15, 2026, supplemental expert disclosures to June 15, 2026, and the dispositive motion deadline to September 14, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, Sacramento Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-CV-02232-TLN-CSK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to modify the operative scheduling order and extend discovery, expert-disclosure, and dispositive-motion deadlines by approximately 90 days.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A scheduling order may be modified only for good cause and by leave of court; the court primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties demonstrated good cause to modify the operative scheduling order and extend the fact-discovery, expert-disclosure, and dispositive-motion deadlines.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties established good cause for modifying the operative scheduling order, and the court granted the stipulated request.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Good cause appearing, the parties’ stipulated request to modify the Court’s operative Scheduling Order (ECF No. 15) is GRANTED.” (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties exchanged initial disclosures, including a large volume of videos and other media, and informally stayed discovery while attempting settlement. After the settlement conference and unaccepted Rule 68 offers did not resolve the case, the parties resumed discovery and completed depositions of both plaintiffs and all three defendant deputies. Plaintiffs had not completed the depositions identified in their PMQ deposition notice because of scheduling constraints, and the parties sought additional time to complete limited discovery and related deadlines.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court entered an operative scheduling order, later modified it, and the parties pursued settlement before undertaking substantial discovery. After settlement efforts failed, the parties completed several depositions but required additional time to complete depositions identified in plaintiffs' deposition notice. The parties jointly requested a further 90-day extension, which the court granted upon finding good cause.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)