

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

**Shannon McGuire and Susan McGuire v. B. Braun Medical Inc. and
B. Braun Interventional Systems Inc.**

McGuire · No. No. 25-393 · Decided April 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana granted in part and denied in part the parties’ joint motion to amend the scheduling order. The court found good cause to reset the trial, pretrial conference, and pretrial order deadlines because of counsel’s scheduling conflicts, but declined to move the other deadlines. A telephone scheduling conference was set for April 16, 2026, and all other deadlines were left unchanged.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sarah S. Vance
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	April 6, 2026
DOCKET	No. 25-393
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly moved to amend the scheduling order, seeking to reset the trial date and associated pretrial deadlines.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A scheduling order may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent. Whether to grant or deny a continuance is reviewed as a matter within the trial court's sound discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties demonstrated good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order.
2. Whether counsel's conflicts with the trial date and the parties' ongoing settlement negotiations justified moving all pretrial deadlines in addition to the trial date.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties demonstrated good cause to reset the trial date because counsel's previously disclosed, continuing scheduling conflicts provided sufficient reason to move the trial.
2. Counsel's conflicts with the trial date did not establish good cause to move all associated pretrial deadlines, and the parties' desire for additional settlement time likewise did not justify modifying those deadlines.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b) provides that “[a] scheduling order may be modified only for good cause and with the judge’s consent.””

“The “good cause standard requires the party seeking relief to show that the deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party needing the extension.””

“Here, the parties have demonstrated good cause to reset the trial date.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs' counsel had previously disclosed scheduling conflicts involving the then-current trial date, and the conflicts had not dissipated. The parties stated that they had diligently engaged in discovery and settlement negotiations. They sought to move the trial and all associated deadlines, but did not demonstrate that the pretrial deadlines could not reasonably be met.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Eastern District of Louisiana under a scheduling order entered September 4, 2025. The parties represented that plaintiffs' counsel had preexisting conflicts with the trial date and that the parties were diligently pursuing discovery and settlement. The court granted the motion in part as to the trial, pretrial conference, and pretrial order deadlines, but denied it as to all other deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- S&W Enter., L.L.C. v. SouthTrust Bank of Ala., NA, 315 F.3d 533, 535 (5th Cir. 2003)
- United States v. Alix, 86 F.3d 429, 434 (5th Cir. 1996)

- *Streber v. Hunter*, 221 F.3d 701, 736 (5th Cir. 2000)
- *HC Gun & Knife Shows, Inc. v. City of Houston*, 201 F.3d 544, 549-50 (5th Cir. 2000)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA SHANNON MCGUIRE AND SUSAN CIVIL ACTION MCGUIRE VERSUS NO. 25-393 B. BRAUN MEDICAL INC. AND B. SECTION “R” (1) BRAUN INTERVENTIONAL SYSTEMS INC. ORDER AND REASONS Before the Court is the joint motion of plaintiff and defendants to amend the scheduling order.¹ The parties aver that plaintiffs’ counsel have prior disclosed scheduling conflicts during the currently set trial date.² They state that said conflicts were disclosed during the original scheduling conference, and that the conflicts have not dissipated in the interim.³ The parties additionally state that they have been diligently engaging in discovery as well as settlement negotiations.⁴ Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b) provides that “[a] scheduling order may be modified only for good cause and with the judge’s consent.” Fed.

R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The “good cause standard requires the party seeking 1 R. Doc. 64. 2 See id. 3 See id. 4 See id. relief to show that the deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party needing the extension.” *S&W Enter., L.L.C. v. SouthTrust Bank of Ala., NA*, 315 F.3d 533, 535 (5th Cir. 2003) (internal citations omitted). Whether to grant or deny a continuance is within the sound discretion of the trial court.

United States v. Alix, 86 F.3d 429, 434 (5th Cir. 1996). In deciding whether to grant a continuance, the Court’s “judgment range is exceedingly wide, for... [it] must consider not only the facts of the particular case but also all of the demands on counsel’s time and the court’s.” *Streber v. Hunter*, 221 F.3d 701, 736 (5th Cir. 2000) (quoting *HC Gun & Knife Shows, Inc. v. City of Houston*, 201 F.3d 544, 549-50 (5th Cir.

2000) (internal quotation marks omitted)). Here, the parties have demonstrated good cause to reset the trial date. Counsels’ conflicts, which they aver pre-existed this matter, provide sufficient reason to move trial.

However, the parties have not provided good cause to move all associated deadlines. Counsels’ conflicts with the trial date itself does not provide good cause to move all pre-trial deadlines. Nor does the parties’ representation that additional time in the schedule may help them negotiate a settlement.

The parties can work toward meeting pre-trial deadlines and a negotiated settlement at the same time. Accordingly, the joint motion of the parties is GRANTED IN PART. The trial, pretrial conference, and pretrial order deadlines shall be reset at a scheduling conference held BY TELEPHONE on APRIL 16, 2026, at 10:00 a.m.

The parties shall call in for the teleconference using phone number (833) 990-9400, Access Code: 124518418. The Court will be represented by its Case Manager at the scheduling conference. The motion is otherwise DENIED. All other deadlines shall remain as set in the September 4, 2025 scheduling order.⁵ New Orleans, Louisiana, this 6th day of April, 2026. —herak Varvee SARAH S. VANCE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 5 R. Doc.

40.