## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS WESTERN DIVISION

,	
Plaintiff(s),	)
	) Case No
VS.	) Judge Iain D. Johnston
	)
Defendant(s).	
Detendant(s).	)
PARTIES' PROPOSED CASE	MANAGEMENT ORDER
This pdf fillable form must be use	
I The manties held a Fed D of Ciry D 2006 months	
I. The parties held a Fed. R. of Civ. P. 26(f) meetin	g on, attended by: for Plaintiff(s), and
	for Defendant(s).
	Tot Detendant(s).
II. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) Disclosures will be exchange	anged by The Court
requires full and proper Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures b	y all parties.
III. Alternative Dispute Resolution Mediation. Court clients have read the Pamphlet governing the court' the dispute resolution options available from the Coconsidered how this case might benefit from those gave their clients an estimate of fees and costs to lit estimate of the fees and costs of an early successful case, defense counsel certify they have discussed the Rule 68 offer of judgment. Failure to comply with See Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(c), (f).	s mediation program, that counsel explained ourt and private entities, and that counsel options. Further, counsel certify that they igate this matter through trial, as well as an mediation. Lastly, if this is a fee shifting e advantages and disadvantages of making a
	after fact discovery after expert discovery.
The parties have reviewed this Court's stand	ling order on settlement conferences.
The parties agree to private ADR. The med	iator/arhitrator is
and the mediation/arbitration is scheduled for	
and the medical distribution is selleduled in	
The parties request this case be excused from	m ADR.

IV.Discovery P	Plan. The	parties jointly	propose the	following	discovery plan:
----------------	-----------	-----------------	-------------	-----------	-----------------

Discovery will be needed on the following subjects. (Do not just write "the claims and defenses in this case," or words to that effect. That is unhelpful.)

A)	Maximum of	interrogatories by each party to any o	ther party.
B)	Maximum of	requests for admission by each party	to any other party.
C)	Maximum of	depositions by Plaintiff(s) and	by Defendant(s).
		ted to hours unless extended by agreer	
		led pleadings, new counts or parties, and the solution 30 days before the close of fact discover	
befo	ore the close of fact disc	(C) disclosures are due by (notery). Absent unusual circumstances, the (2)(C) witnesses if opinion testimony will	e Court considers treating
	\ / II	s will be made in a timely manner, but no le the close of fact discovery).	later than
H)	Fact discovery ends	·	
I)	The parties anticipate re	etained experts on the following subjects:	
Dep	osition of the Plaintiff's	expert retained under Rule 26(a)(2)(B) is dexpert shall be taken by	
Rep Der	oort from the Defendant'	s expert retained under Rule $26(a)(2)(B)$ is	s due by
(Th	e parties must give serio	t's expert shall be taken byus thought to whether for this case (1) reta	 ined experts are
nec Exp	essary, or (2) need to be ert, 40 A.B.A. SEC. LITIO	deposed. <i>See</i> Gregory P. Joseph, <i>The Tem</i> G. 1 (2014); William Cirignani, <i>The Case J</i> AL JOURNAL 20 (Winter 2016)).	iptation to Depose Every
	Dispositive motions are covery).	e due by (no <i>later</i> than 30 days a	after the close of fact
K)	The parties suggest the	next status hearing with the Court be	·
L) bev		ulate to extend discovery deadlines, include the case management order.	uding for depositions,

- M) These dates will not be amended absent a showing of good cause. The parties understand that with entry of this case management order, the deadlines set out in the order are governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4), and requests for extensions require a showing of good cause under that Rule. Motions for extensions of time should be brought as soon as possible, but at a minimum before the cut-off date. Failure to do so does not demonstrate diligence, and runs the serious risk that the motion will be denied. See McCann v. Cullinan, 11 CV 50125, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91362 (N.D. Ill. Jul. 14, 2015)
- V. <u>Electronically Stored Information</u>. Electronically stored information that can reasonably be anticipated to be relevant to the litigation will be preserved. When balancing the cost, burden, and need for electronically stored information, the Court and the parties will apply the proportionality standards embodied in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) and (b)(2)(B), as well as consider the technological feasibility and realistic costs of preserving, retrieving, reviewing, and producing electronically stored information. The parties and the Court will discuss and consider any appropriate and reasonable technologies that might further the goals of Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. Counsel should review the helpful information found at <a href="www.ediscoverycouncil.com">www.ediscoverycouncil.com</a>, including the 7th Circuit Council on eDiscovery and Digital Information Model Discovery Plan.
- VI. <u>Claims of Privilege or of Protection.</u> The parties shall detail below any agreements reached for asserting claims of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation material after information is produced, including whether they seek entry of their agreement as an order under Fed. R. Evid. 502. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(3)(B)(iv) and 26(f).

Absent any specific agreement reached by the parties, the following provisions will apply:

- 1) The production of privileged or work-product protected documents, electronically stored information ("ESI") or information, whether inadvertent or otherwise, is not a waiver of the privilege or protection from discovery in this case or in any other federal or state proceeding. This order shall be interpreted to provide the maximum protection allowed by Fed. R. Evid. 502(d).
- 2) Nothing contained herein is intended to or shall serve to limit a party's right to conduct a review of documents, ESI or information (including metadata) for relevance, responsiveness and/or segregation of privileged and/or protected information before production.

Signatures certify that this form was used as is and not retyped, the parties and counsel understand they cannot extend deadlines without a court order, any request to extend a deadline requires a showing of good cause under Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4), and failing to seek an extension before a deadline has passed does not establish good cause/diligence.

PLAINTIFF(S)	DEFENDANT(S)
By:	By:

Additional information may be included on separate sheets of paper attached to this order.

Rev. 3/4/2024