

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Cardenas v. Butler

No. 2:23-cv-0500 TLN AC P (E.D. Cal. July 30, 2025) · No. No. 2:23-cv-0500 TLN AC P · Decided July 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California partially grants plaintiff Marvin Cardenas’s motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order. The court extends the deadline to serve discovery requests to September 2, 2025, the discovery completion and discovery-dispute deadlines to November 3, 2025, and the pretrial-motion deadline to January 26, 2025, as stated in the order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison Claire
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 30, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:23-cv-0500 TLN AC P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the discovery and scheduling order and extend the deadlines for serving and completing discovery. The court granted the motion in part.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), modification of a scheduling order requires good cause, with the inquiry focused primarily on the moving party's diligence. Courts also consider prejudice, the imminence of trial, foreseeability of the need for additional discovery, and the likelihood that further discovery will produce relevant evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished; nonprecedential district-court order
PARTIES	Marvin Cardenas v. Butler, et al.

TOPICS

discovery dispute

motion to amend

civil procedure

prisoners rights

section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the discovery and scheduling order.
2. Whether the court should extend the deadlines for serving discovery requests and completing discovery.
3. Whether the dispositive-motion deadline should be modified as a consequence of extending discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff established good cause for a limited modification of the discovery and scheduling order, but not for the four-month extension he requested.
2. The court granted plaintiff thirty days to serve discovery requests, extended the discovery-completion deadline to November 3, 2025, and set November 3, 2025, as the deadline for discovery motions to compel.
3. The court modified the pretrial-motion deadline to January 26, 2025, as stated in the order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Good cause to extend the discovery deadline exists “if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension.”” (at 2)

“Although the existence or degree of prejudice to the party opposing the modification might supply additional reasons to deny a motion, the focus of the inquiry is upon the moving party’s reasons for seeking modification.” (at 2)

“The court will grant plaintiff thirty days to serve his discovery requests.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court's scheduling order required discovery requests to be served by May 26, 2025, and discovery to be completed by July 25, 2025. Plaintiff, an incarcerated litigant pursuing medical deliberate-indifference claims against seven defendants, asserted that he needed additional time to learn how to conduct discovery, obtain assistance, propound discovery, and respond to defendants' requests. He filed his motion before the then-existing discovery deadline and had previously sought and received a one-week extension.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court entered a discovery and scheduling order setting May 26, 2025, as the deadline to serve discovery and July 25, 2025, as the deadline to complete discovery. Plaintiff previously obtained a short extension of the discovery-completion deadline to August 2, 2025. Before discovery closed, plaintiff filed a second motion

seeking to extend discovery-related deadlines to October 1, 2025; the court granted a shorter extension and modified the dispositive-motion deadline.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 608-09 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Coleman v. Quaker Oats Co., 232 F.3d 1271, 1294-95 (9th Cir. 2000)
- City of Pomona v. SQM N. Am. Corp., 866 F.3d 1060, 1066 (9th Cir. 2017)
- United States ex rel. Schumer v. Hughes Aircraft Co., 63 F.3d 1152, 1526 (9th Cir. 1995), vacated on other grounds, 520 U.S. 939 (1997)
- W. Coast Theater Corp. v. City of Portland, 897 F.2d 1519, 1524 (9th Cir. 1990)
- G&M Farms Inc. v. E.I. du Pont, No. 1:24-cv-0213 JLT BAM, 2024 WL 4950175, at *3, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 218875, at *9 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2024)
- Porter v. Solano County Sheriff's Office, No. 2:21-cv-1473 KJM JDP, 2024 WL 3361138, at *1, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 121022, at *4 (E.D. Cal. July 10, 2024)