

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Akiva Israel v. Robert Negrete

Israel v. Negrete · No. 2:22-cv-1391 TLN CSK P · Decided December 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants the plaintiff's second motion to modify the scheduling order in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court extends the discovery deadline to March 31, 2026, and the deadline for other pretrial motions to May 29, 2026, based on good cause and the parties' agreement.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 16, 2025
DOCKET	2:22-cv-1391 TLN CSK P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a second modification of the scheduling order, including an extension of the discovery deadline. Defendant did not oppose the requested modification.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court has broad discretion in supervising the pretrial phase of litigation; modification of a scheduling order requires good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited persuasive value.
PARTIES	Akiva Israel v. Robert Negrete

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order and extend the discovery and pretrial-motions deadlines.

HOLDINGS

1. The court held that good cause existed to modify the scheduling order and extend the discovery and pretrial-motions deadlines.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The schedule may be modified ‘if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension.’” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had previously extended the discovery deadline to September 18, 2025, and the pretrial-motions deadline to November 17, 2025. Plaintiff had pending a motion to compel discovery and an amended motion to issue a subpoena, while defense counsel described extensive efforts to schedule plaintiff's deposition. Defendant did not oppose plaintiff's request for additional time.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court issued a discovery and scheduling order on March 31, 2025, and previously modified it on July 9, 2025. Plaintiff then filed a second motion to modify the scheduling order, and defense counsel submitted a declaration stating that defendant did not oppose the requested extensions. The district court granted the motion and revised the discovery and pretrial-motion deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 607 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002)