

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

**Fifteen Twenty-One Second Avenue Condominium Association v.
Viracon LLC, et al.**

Fifteen Twenty-One Second Avenue · No. No. 23-cv-1999-BJR · Decided December 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington confirms a previously granted 90-day continuance of the pretrial and trial deadlines and denies further modification of the scheduling order. The court also declines to impose sanctions, re-notes all currently pending motions to December 15, 2025, and directs the parties to refrain from filing further motions until the court decides the cross-motions for summary judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbara Jacobs Rothstein
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 18, 2025
DOCKET	No. 23-cv-1999-BJR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered reconsideration of its order continuing the trial, twelve additional pending motions, and Plaintiff's request for sanctions and a shorter continuance.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied a good-cause standard to the requested continuance and scheduling-order modification; the opinion does not identify a separate formal standard of review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- summary judgment
- sanctions
- motion for reconsideration

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- construction law
- real estate

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported continuing the pretrial and trial deadlines for 90 days.
2. Whether the scheduling order should be modified again to shorten or otherwise alter the continuance.
3. Whether Defendants should be sanctioned for their handling of the continuance motion.
4. How the pending motions should be re-noted in light of the completed briefing.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause supported continuing the trial and pretrial deadlines for 90 days because the court needed uninterrupted time to resolve the numerous pending motions and supplemental briefing.
2. The court declined to make any further modification to the scheduling order and left the order granting the 90-day continuance in effect.
3. Sanctions were unwarranted under the circumstances presented, so Plaintiff's request for sanctions was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court needs time, uninterrupted by further motions and supplemental briefing in this case, to consider and resolve the currently pending motions.” (at 2)

“Accordingly, the Court confirms its order granting a 90-day continuance of the trial, and the scheduling order issued at ECF No. 276 stands without further modification.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case had twelve pending motions, including two cross-motions for summary judgment, six Daubert motions, and motions concerning sanctions or exclusions related to briefing. Supplemental briefing and additional filings delayed the court's ability to resolve the motions, with the briefing becoming fully ripe on December 15, 2025. Plaintiff did not dispute that the court needed time to resolve the myriad motions but opposed a 90-day continuance and sought sanctions against Defendants.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously granted Defendants' motion to continue the pretrial and trial deadlines for 90 days. Plaintiff opposed the continuance, sought to limit it to 45 days, and requested sanctions against Defendants. After reviewing the opposition, reply, record, and legal authorities, the court confirmed the 90-day continuance, denied sanctions, denied further modification of the scheduling order, and re-noted all pending motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579, 592 n.10 (1993)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-was/2025/fifteen-twenty-one-second-avenue-condominium-association-v-ttdj8agd>