	Case 1:09-cv-00509-LJO-SKO Document	t 40 Filed 11/04/10 Page 1 of 5					
1	Thomas E. Donahue (SBN 156279)						
2	DONAHUE & HORROW, LLP 1960 E. Grand Ave., Suite 1215						
3	El Segundo, California 90245 Telephone: (310) 322-0300						
4	Facsimile: (310) 322-0302 Email: <u>tdonahue@donahuehorrow.com</u>						
5	Attorneys for Plaintiffs MIGUEL GONZALEZ, JR.,						
6	a minor, by and through his guardian ad litem,						
7	Maria Gonzalez, MARIA GONZALEZ and MIGUEL GONZALEZ						
8							
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
10	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
11							
12	MIGUEL GONZALEZ, JR., a minor, by	CASE NO.: 1:09-cv-00509 LJO SKO					
13	and through his guardian ad litem, Maria Gonzalez, MARIA GONZALEZ and						
14	MIGUEL GONZALEZ,						
15	Plaintiffs,	JOINT STIPULATION OF THE					
16	VS.	PARTIES; ORDER					
17	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,						
18	GURVIR KHURANA, M.D.; KERN						
19	MEDICAL CENTER; and DOES 1						
20	through 300, inclusive Defendants.						
21	through 300, inclusive						
21 22	through 300, inclusive Defendants.	ed action, subject to the Court's approval,					
21	through 300, inclusive Defendants.	ed action, subject to the Court's approval,					
21 22 23 24 25	through 300, inclusive Defendants. The parties to the above reference hereby stipulate to the following:	ed action, subject to the Court's approval,					
21 22 23 24	through 300, inclusive Defendants. The parties to the above reference hereby stipulate to the following: WHEREAS the parties desire to co						
21 22 23 24 25 26	through 300, inclusive Defendants. The parties to the above reference hereby stipulate to the following: WHEREAS the parties desire to co	ontinue fact discovery and expert discovery					
21 22 23 24 25 26 27	through 300, inclusive Defendants. The parties to the above reference hereby stipulate to the following: WHEREAS the parties desire to co related dates contained in the Court's N Order.	ontinue fact discovery and expert discovery					

		1			
	Case 1:09-cv-00509-LJO-SKO Document 40 Filed 11/04/10 Page 2 of 5				
1	Plaintiffs' trial counsel, Thomas E. Donahue, has had trial conflicts (back to back trials				
2	since August 2010 and continuing to mid to late December 2010) that have prevented				
3					
4	Mr. Donahue from engaging in the necessary fact discovery in this matter. The parties				
5	have been working together to schedule the depositions and discovery that remain. In				
6	an effort to accommodate Mr. Donahue's impacted trial schedule and to allow				
7	Plaintiffs and the defendants to meaningfully participate in necessary discovery, the				
8					
9	parties HEREBY AGREE, subject to the Court's approval, to modify the fact				
10	discovery and expert discovery related dates contained in the Court's Scheduling				
11 12	Conference Order, dated November 9, 2009, as follows:				
13	1. The cut-off for non-expert discovery, previously set for November 15,				
14	2010, shall be continued for seventy-five (75) days, or until January 31, 2011.				
15					
16	2. Plaintiff's expert witness disclosure deadline, previously set for				
17	December 15, 2010, shall be continued for sixty (60) days, or until February 15, 2011.				
18 19	3. Defendant's expert witness disclosure deadline, previously set for				
20	January 14, 2011, shall be continued for sixty (60) days, or until March 14, 2011.				
21	4. The parties' deadline to disclose supplemental expert witnesses,				
22					
23	previously set for February 15, 2011, shall be continued for sixty (60) days, or until				
24	April 15, 2011.				
25	The parties also HEREBY AGREE, subject to the Court's approval, that the				
26					
27	following dates, contained in the Court's Scheduling Conference Order, dated				
28	November 9, 2009, remain as follows:				

1	Case 1:09-cv-00509-LJO-SKO Docu	ment 40 Filed 11/04/10 Page 3 of 5				
1 2		The cut-off for expert discovery shall remain June 24, 2011.				
3 4	2. The deadline for filing	The deadline for filing non-dispositive motions shall remain June 24,				
5	2011.					
6 7	3. The deadline for filing d	The deadline for filing dispositive motions shall remain July 22, 2011.				
8	4. The Pre-Trial Conference	The Pre-Trial Conference date shall remain September 15, 2011.				
9	5. The Trial Date shall rem	5. The Trial Date shall remain October 31, 2011.				
10		Respectfully submitted,				
11						
12 13		UNITED STATES ATTORNEY				
15 14	Dated: November 1, 2010	By: <u>\S\ Jason Ehrlinspiel</u>				
15		Lawrence G. Brown Jason Ehrlinspiel				
16		Attorneys for Defendant United States of America				
17		LEBEAU THELEN, LLP				
18	Dated: November 1, 2010	By: <u>\S\ Dennis Thelen</u>				
19 20		Dennis R. Thelen, Esq.				
20		Attorneys for Defendant Gurvir Khurana, M.D.				
21						
23		PATTERSON, LOCKWOOD, HARRIS,				
24		JURICH & HILLYER, LLP				
25	Dated: November 1, 2010	By:\S\ John Jurich				
26		John A. Jurich				
27		Attorneys for Defendant County of Kern (erroneously sued as Kern Medical Center)				
28						

	Case 1:09-cv-00509-LJO-SKO Docur	nent 40 Filed 11/04/10 Page 4 of 5			
1					
2					
3		COUNTY COUNSEL OF THE COUNTY OF KERN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
4	D (1 N 1 1 2010				
5	Dated: November 1, 2010	By: <u>\S\ Jennifer Zahry</u> B.C. Barmann, Sr.			
6		Jennifer E. Zahry			
7 8		Attorneys for Defendant County of Kern (erroneously sued as Kern Medical Center)			
9		DONAHUE & HORROW, LLP			
10	Dated: November 1, 2010	By:\S\ Thomas Donahue			
11		Thomas E. Donahue Attorneys for Plaintiffs Miguel Gonzales, Jr.,			
12		Attorneys for Plaintiffs Miguel Gonzales, Jr., a minor, by and through his guardian ad litem, Maria Gonzalez, Maria Gonzalez, and			
13		Miguel Gonzalez			
14	ORDER				
15	The parties' request for an extensi	on of the discovery deadlines as outlined above is			
16 17	GRANTED. All other deadlines, including those applicable for filing and hearing all pre-trial				
18	motions, the pre-trial conference date, and the trial date remain UNCHANGED.				
19	The parties are reminded that, pursuant to the scheduling order issued in this case, any				
20	"[s]tipulations extending the deadlines contained [in the scheduling order] will not be considered				
21	unless they are accompanied by affidavits or declarations and, where appropriate, attached exhibits				
22	which establish good cause for granting the relief requested." (Doc. 35.) Any future requests for				
23	modification that do not comply with the scheduling order will not be considered and may result in				
24 25	the imposition of sanctions.				
23 26					
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
28	Dated: <u>November 3, 2010</u>	/s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
		4			

	Case 1:09-cv-00509-LJO-SKO	Document 40	Filed 11/04/10	Page 5 of 5
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				