

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Bobby Rankin v. Jefferson Parish Sheriff’s Section “R” Office et al.

Rankin · No. 25-623 · Decided March 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana grants the parties’ joint motion to amend the scheduling order. Finding good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), the Court continues the trial and all unexpired associated deadlines to be reset at a telephone scheduling conference on April 30, 2026.

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	March 20, 2026
DOCKET	25-623
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly moved to amend the scheduling order to obtain additional time for discovery and to continue the trial and related deadlines.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A scheduling-order modification under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) requires good cause, and the decision whether to grant a continuance lies within the trial court’s sound discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; generally nonprecedential.

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order and continue the trial and associated unexpired deadlines.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties demonstrated good cause to modify the scheduling order because additional discovery time was reasonably necessary after the scope of plaintiff's claims became clear, and the court therefore continued the trial and all unexpired associated deadlines.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"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.'"

"The Court finds that the parties have shown good cause to continue the trial and unexpired associated deadlines."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought the action on March 31, 2025, and later filed a third amended complaint on January 26, 2026. The parties represented that the scope of plaintiff's claims had only recently become clear, making additional discovery time necessary. Trial was set for August 10, 2026, with pretrial deadlines scheduled throughout the spring and summer; the parties stated that no prior extensions had been requested and that the requested continuance would not prejudice either side.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on March 31, 2025, and filed a third amended complaint on January 26, 2026. With trial set for August 10, 2026, the parties jointly sought additional time because the scope of plaintiff's claims had only recently become clear. The court granted the motion in part by continuing the trial and all unexpired associated deadlines, while leaving expired deadlines unchanged.

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 BOBBY RANKIN CIVIL ACTION VERSUS NO. 25-623 JEFFERSON PARISH SHERIFF'S SECTION "R" (2) OFFICE ET AL. ORDER AND REASONS Before the Court is the joint motion of plaintiffs and defendant to amend the scheduling order.¹ The parties argue additional time for discovery is necessary because the scope of Plaintiff's claims was only recently made clear.² Plaintiff brought this lawsuit on March 31, 2025,³ and he filed his third amended complaint on January 26, 2026.⁴ Trial is presently set for August 10, 2026, and pre-trial deadlines are currently set throughout the Spring and Summer of 2026.⁵ The parties aver that this motion will not prejudice any party, and that no previous extensions have been sought.⁶ 1 R. Doc.

51. 2 Id. at ¶ 7. 3 R. Doc. 1. 4 R. Doc. 44. 5 R. Doc. 19. 6 R. Doc. 51 at ¶¶ 9-10. Rule 16(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 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 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)). The Court finds that the parties have shown good cause to continue the trial and unexpired associated deadlines. Accordingly, the Court continues the trial and associated unexpired deadlines to be reset at a scheduling conference held BY TELEPHONE on APRIL 30, 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. All deadlines that have already expired are not reset. New Orleans, Louisiana, this 20th day of March, 2026. bern Varner SARAH S. VANCE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE