Semper et a v. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department et al

Doc. 155

1	April 22, 2024. This Motion is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the
2	following Declaration of Christopher Peterson, and the papers and pleadings already on file herein.
3	Defendants' counsel has represented that they do not oppose the requested extension.
4	DATED: Apil 11, 2024
5	
6	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF NEVADA
7	
8	/s/ Christopher Peterson CHRISTOPHER M. PETERSON, ESQ.
9	Nevada Bar No.: 13932 SADMIRA RAMIC
10	Nevada Bar No.: 15984 JACOB SMITH, ESQ
11	Nevada Bar No.: 16324 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
12	UNION OF NEVADA 4362 W. Cheyenne Ave. North Las Vegas, NV 89032
13	Telephone: (702) 366-1226 Facsimile: (702) 366-1331
14	Emails: peterson@aclunv.org ramic@aclunv.org
15	jsmith@aclunv.org
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## **DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER M. PETERSON ESQ.**

I, Christopher M. Peterson, hereby declare as follows:

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

- 1. I am duly licensed to practice law in the State of Nevada and have personal knowledge of and I am competent to testify concerning the facts herein.
- 2. I represent the Plaintiffs in the above-captioned matter as lead counsel.
- 3. I am the Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada.
- I make this declaration in support of Plaintiffs Motion to Extend Deadline for Opposition to Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment.
- Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in this matter on March 25, 2024. [ECF No. 142]
- The current deadline for Plaintiffs opposition to Defendants motion for summary judgment is April 15, 2024.
- 7. Plaintiffs request 7 days additional time to complete the opposition to Defendants motion for summary judgment changing this deadline to April 22, 2024.
- 8. Plaintiffs believe there is good cause to extend this deadline for the following reasons:
  - a. I emailed Jacqueline Nichols, counsel for Defendants, on April 11, 2024, asking if they would oppose this motion to extend time; Ms. Nichols responded stating they had no opposition to this motion.
  - b. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is 59 pages, *see* [ECF No. 142], almost twice as long as a typical motion for summary judgment; accordingly, counsel needs more time to review the arguments, conduct relevant research, and draft responses.
  - c. Due to the length of the Defendant's motion, Plaintiffs may need to request to exceed the page limits for the opposition to Defendants motion for summary judgment.
  - d. As Legal Director for the ACLU of Nevada, I represented the appellees in an oral argument before the Nevada Supreme Court on April 9, 2024, for *State of Nevada*

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Plaintiffs are seeking a seven-day extension from the current deadline of April 15, 2024 to April 22, 2024, to file an opposition to Defendants motion for summary judgment [ECF No. 142].

A motion to extend time filed before the deadline of the motion it seeks to extend must be supported by a showing of good cause. Local Rule IA 6-1; Local Rule 26-3; Fed. Rules Civ. Proc. 6(b)(1)(A); *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 610 (9th Cir. 1992). Good cause under FRCP 6 is not a rigorous or high standard. *Ahanchion v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010). Absent bad faith, a timely extension sought under FRCP 6 will often be granted. *Id.* at 1259.

The good cause analysis rests on a party's diligence in adhering to the deadlines set by the court. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). This measure of diligence considers the diligence displayed throughout the entire case. *Williams v. James River Grp. Inc.*, 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1177 (D. Nev. 2022). The degree of prejudice to the opposing party may also be considered. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). Plaintiffs have consistently met the deadlines set forth by this Court throughout this matter, and as Defendants' counsel have stated they would not oppose this motion, it does not appear that they will suffer any prejudice.

Courts have found that an attorney's "conflicting professional engagements" can satisfy a finding of good cause to extend a deadline. *Johnson v. Barrett*, No. 2:17-cv-02304-RFB-BNW, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201338, at \*2 (D. Nev. Oct. 16, 2021) (quoting *Canup v. Miss. Valley Barge Line Co.*, 31 F.R.D. 282, 283 (D. Pa. 1962)). Courts have also found good cause for an extension when the size of the responsive document is extensive, the party requesting extension has multiple conflicting deadlines, and the opposing party does not object to the extension. *Atlp v. Corecivic, Inc.*, No. 2:21-cv-02072-JCM-EJY, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2955, at \*3 (D. Nev. Jan. 2, 2024). Plaintiffs' counsel have had multiple professional engagements since Defendants' filed their motion for summary

judgment, including argument before Nevada's highest state court on a case involving multiple issues of first impression and filing deadlines related to substantive motions pending before the United States District Court for Nevada in *McAllister et al. v. Clark County*, limiting counsels' capacity.

Other reasons for good cause exist. First, Plaintiffs will need to file additional motions related to Defendants' filings on April 5, 2024, and April 9, 2024, to clarify what documents Plaintiffs will need to respond to and when. Second, as parties received permission from the Court to exceed page limits on their respective motions for summary judgment, Plaintiffs are responding to a motion for summary judgment that is significantly longer than is typically permissible under LR. Naturally, the longer motion requires more time to review, research, and respond to. While Plaintiffs may need to draft and file a motion to exceed page limit in support of their response, counsel is also using the extension to prevent as much excess as possible.

Plaintiffs contacted Jacqueline Nichols, counsel of record for Defendants via email. Ms. Nichols represented that the Defendants had no opposition to the requested extension.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

1	For the above reasons, Plaintiffs request pursuant to this unopposed motion that the deadline
2	for Plaintiffs opposition to Defendants motion for summary judgment be modified seven days from
3	its current deadline of April 15, 2024, to April 22, 2024.
4	
5	DATED: April 11, 2024
6	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF NEVADA
7	OI NEVILOIT
8	/s/ Christopher Peterson
9	CHRISTOPHER M. PETERSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No.: 13932
10	SADMIRA RAMIC Nevada Bar No.: 15984 LA COR SMITH, ESO
11	JACOB SMITH, ESQ Nevada Bar No.: 16324 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
12	UNION OF NEVADA 4362 W. Cheyenne Ave.
13	North Las Vegas, NV 89032 Telephone: (702) 366-1226
14	Facsimile: (702) 366-1331 Emails: peterson@aclunv.org
15	ramic@aclunv.org jsmith@aclunv.org
16	
17	
18	
19	IT IS SO ORDERED:
20	Xellus C. Mahan
21	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22	<b>DATED:</b> April 12, 2024
23	
24	

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
	I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing Motion to Extend Time with the
2	Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court by using the court's CM/ECF system on Apri
3	11, 2024. I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and tha
4	service will be accomplished on all participants by:
5	
6	⊠ CM/ECF
7	Electronic mail; or
8	US Mail or Carrier Service
9	
10	
11	/s/Christopher Peterson
12	/s/Christopher Peterson An employee of ACLU of Nevada
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	