

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Sansone v. Charter Communications, Inc.

No. 17-cv-01880-WQH-JLB (S.D. Cal. Aug. 8, 2025) · No. 17-cv-01880-WQH-JLB · Decided August 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California granted the parties’ joint motion to continue all deadlines by at least sixty days. The order modified the scheduling deadlines for expert disclosures and discovery, pretrial motions, settlement proceedings, the final pretrial conference, and related matters. It also set a mandatory settlement conference for February 11, 2026, and included directions for participation by Zoom.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jill L. Burkhardt
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	August 8, 2025
DOCKET	17-cv-01880-WQH-JLB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly moved to continue all deadlines by at least sixty days while Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration and Defendants' motion for decertification were pending.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied a good-cause standard to the request to modify the scheduling order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished_nonprecedential

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- sanctions
- mediation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- class actions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed to continue the deadlines in the operative scheduling order by at least sixty days.
2. What revised deadlines and procedural requirements should govern expert disclosures, discovery disputes, settlement proceedings, pretrial preparation, and motions.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties' joint motion to continue all deadlines by at least sixty days was granted because good cause appeared.
2. The modified scheduling order governs the parties' expert disclosures, expert discovery, discovery-dispute procedures, motions, settlement conference, and pretrial obligations; failure to comply may result in waiver, evidence preclusion, or sanctions as specified in the order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Good cause appearing, the joint motion is GRANTED. Accordingly, the operative Scheduling Order (ECF No. 252) is MODIFIED as follows:” (at 1)

“Discovery disputes must be brought to the Court’s attention in the time and manner required by § V of Judge Burkhardt’s Civil Chambers Rules.” (at 2)

“A failure to comply in this regard will result in a waiver of a party’s discovery issue.” (at 2-3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties requested a sixty-day extension of all dates and deadlines because Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration and Defendants' motion for decertification were pending. The court found good cause and reset the operative scheduling order, including deadlines for expert disclosures, discovery, settlement, pretrial filings, and motions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Southern District of California under an operative scheduling order. The court granted the parties' joint motion and modified the scheduling order to establish new expert, discovery, settlement, pretrial, and motion deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Pitman v. Brinker Int’l, Inc., 216 F.R.D. 481, 485–86 (D. Ariz. 2003)