Miller v. Clark County et al

Doc. 39

RICHARD HARRIS

1	I. Disco	OVERY COMPLETED TO DATE	
2	The parties have participated in the following discovery to date:		
3	1.	Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Initial disclosures;	
4	2.	Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) First Supplemental disclosures;	
5	3.	3. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Second Supplemental disclosures;	
6	4. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Third Supplemental disclosures;		
7	5. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Fourth Supplemental disclosures;		
8	6. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Fifth Supplemental disclosures;		
9	7. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Sixth Supplemental disclosures;		
10	8. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Seventh Supplemental disclosures;		
11	9. Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a)(1) Eighth Supplemental disclosures;		
12	10. Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) Initial disclosures;		
13	11. Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) First Supplemental disclosures;		
14	12.	Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) Second Supplemental disclosures;	
15	13.	Defendant Clark County's FRCP 26(a)(1) Third Supplemental disclosures;	
16	14.	Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) Initial disclosures;	
17	15.	Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) First Supplemental disclosures;	
18	16.	Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) Second Supplemental	
19	disclosures;		
20	17.	Defendant Preventative Measures' FRCP 26(a)(1) Third Supplemental disclosures	
21	18.	Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Preventive	
22	Measures;		
23	19.	Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to	
24	Preventive M	leasures;	
25	20.	Defendant Clark County's First Set of Interrogatories to Preventive Measures;	
26	21.	Defendant Preventive Measures' Response to Defendant Clark County's First Se	
27	of Requests f	for Admissions;	
28	22.	Defendant Preventive Measures' Response to Defendant Clark County's First Se	

	11	Production of Documents;		
	12	29.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defend	
	13	30.	Defendant Preventive Measures	
IS	14	31.	Defendant Preventive Measures	
VRRIS FIRM	15	32.	Defendant Preventive Measures	
UCHARD HARRIS	16	to Plaintiff;		
RD L	17	33.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defend	
HA	18	Admissions;		
RIC	19	34.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defend	
	20	Production of	Documents;	
	21	35.	Plaintiff's Responses to D	
	22	Interrogatorie	s;	
	23	36.	Plaintiff's First Set of Interroga	

41.

of Requests	for Production of Documents;
23.	Defendant Preventive Measures' Response to Defendant Clark County's First Se
of Interrogate	ories;
24.	Defendant Clark County's First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiff;
25.	Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Plaintiff;
26.	Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to
Plaintiff;	
27.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for
Admissions;	
28.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Clark County's First Set of Requests for
Production o	f Documents;
29.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Clark County's First Set of Interrogatories;
30.	Defendant Preventive Measures' First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiff;
31.	Defendant Preventive Measures' First Set of Requests for Admissions to Plaintiff;
32.	Defendant Preventive Measures' First Set of Requests for Production of Documents
to Plaintiff;	
33.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Preventive Measures First Set of Requests for
Admissions;	
34.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Preventive Measures First Set of Requests for
Production o	f Documents;
35.	Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Preventive Measures First Set of
Interrogatori	es;
36.	Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant Preventive Measures;
37.	Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Defendant Preventive Measures
38.	Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production to Defendant Preventive Measures
39.	Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to Defendant Clark County;
40.	Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Admissions to Defendant Clark County;

Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production to Defendant Clark County;

42.

² Admissions to Defendant Preventive Measures;				Defendant Preventive Measures;			
	3		43.	Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories to			
	4	Defendant Clark County;					
	5		44.	Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests fo			
	6	Admissions to Defendant Clark County;					
	7		45.	Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests fo			
	8	Production to Defendant Clark County;					
	9		46.	Defendant Preventive Measures' Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of			
	10	Interrogatories and Request for Production; and					
	11	II.	Disco	OVERY REMAINING TO BE COMPLETED			
	12		1.	Deposition of Plaintiff (currently scheduled for February 21, 2024);			
	13		2.	Deposition of Kate Murray (currently scheduled for February 15, 2024);			
	14		3.	Deposition of Brian Cooperman (currently scheduled for February 15, 2024);			
	15		4.	Deposition of Elando Johnson (currently scheduled for February 15, 2024);			
	16		5.	Deposition of newly added Defendant Marco Solorio;			
	17		6.	Deposition of newly added Defendant Leonard Morris;			
	18		7.	Deposition of David Sutton (current or former employee of Defendant Preventative			
	19	Measu	ıres);				
	20		8.	Depositions of other fact witnesses present at the County Commission meeting			
	21	during the subject incident;					
	22		9.	Supplemental FRCP 26 disclosures;			
	23		10.	Expert disclosures;			
	24		11.	Deposition of parties' treating physicians and/or experts;			
	25		12.	Any additional discovery that is necessary as the parties proceed through discovery			
	26	III.	REASO	ONS WHY DISCOVERY NOT COMPLETED WITHIN TIME SET BY DISCOVERY PLAN			
	27		A mot	ion to extend deadlines articulated in the court's scheduling order must be supported			
	28	by a sh	nowing	of good cause. See Local Rule 26-3; see also Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.			

Defendant Preventive Measures' Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

975 F.2d 604, 608-09 (9th Cir. 1992). Good cause to extend a deadline exists if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking extension. Johnson, 975 F.2d at 609. In the instant matter, all parties have diligently attempted to comply with the Court's scheduling order however, the parties have determined they will be unable to obtain unable to obtain and produce key evidence related to the incident and alleged damages, which then deprives the parties and their respective experts of access to all evidence to formulate their opinions, complete their evaluations and prepare their reports accordingly, as well as impairs counsels ability to reach a proper determination as to further discovery needed. A few procedural issues have been pending that have influenced the parties' ability to conduct the necessary discovery in this matter:

- 1. Mr. Miller was recently incarcerated and is currently an inmate at Southern Desert Correctional Center. On October 2, 2023, Defendant Clark County filed a motion for leave to take Mr. Miller's deposition. See ECF Doc. 14. Plaintiff's counsel filed a notice of non-opposition on October 18, 2023. See ECF Doc. 24. On January 2, 2024, the Court granted Defendant Clark County's Motion to take Plaintiff's deposition. See ECF Doc. 33. The parties have already coordinated with Southern Desert Correctional Center to conduct Plaintiff's in-person deposition on February 21, 2024.
- 2. On October 10, 2023, the Court issued an order granting Mr. Miller's request to amend his complaint to add Defendants Marco Solorio and Leonard Morris. See ECF Doc. 15. Mr. Miller subsequently filed the First Amended Complaint ("FAC") the following day. See ECF Doc. 17. Service of the first amended complaint and summonses has been complete. Defendant Solorio and Morris recently filed an answer to the FAC on January 11, 2024. See ECF Doc. 35 and 36.
- 3. On October 16, 2023, Defendant Clark County moved to amend the Crossclaim that it asserted against Defendant Preventative Measures. See ECF Doc. 19. On January 2, 2024, the Court also granted Defendant Clark County's motion to amend the cross claim that it asserted against Defendant Preventative Measures. See ECF Doc. 33. Defendant/Cross claimant Clark County subsequently filed its amended cross claim on January 10, 2024. See ECF Doc. 34. Defendant/Cross defendant Preventative Measures has yet to respond Defendant/Cross claimant Clark County's amended cross claim.

4. On October 24, 2023, Plaintiff conferred with counsel for the Defendants via email about the deposition availability of the following current or former employees of the Defendants: Elando Johnson (Clark County employee), Katie Murray (Clark County employee), Brian Copperman (Clark County employee), Jon Kitchen (Preventative Measures employee), and David Sutton (Preventative Measures employee). Since Plaintiff's inquiry regarding these depositions, Defense counsel has diligently attempted to locate/coordinate the availability of these current/former employees. Recently, the parties were able to set the depositions Elando Johnson (Clark County employee), Katie Murray (Clark County employee), Brian Copperman (Clark County employee) – which are all scheduled for February 15, 2024. The parties are still trying to coordinate the deposition availability Jon Kitchen (Preventative Measures employee), David Sutton (Preventative Measures employee) along with the newly added defendants, Marco Solorio and Leonard Morris. however, with little success.

5. Lastly, counsel for Defendant Preventative Measures has a firm trial setting through mid-February 2024.

In sum, the parties cannot meet the expert deadline and complete discovery within the current dates due to the reasons above. The parties believe that the depositions of Mr. Miller and the current and former employees of Clark County and Preventative Measures are critical to the opinions of the parties' liability experts in this matter and, out of an abundance of caution, the parties seek the requested extension to ensure that there is sufficient time to locate these employees, set their respective depositions, and to allow the parties' expert witnesses to a fair opportunity to consider these individuals' testimony so that they can formulating their expert opinions. Equally important, the parties are also engaging in attempts to resolve this matter before expending more time and resources on discovery. Accordingly, the parties respectfully request that the discovery deadlines in this matter be extended by an additional ninety (90) days. requested extension will ensure all parties have a full and fair opportunity to litigate the claims and defenses on the merits. Therefore, and as set forth below, due diligence and good cause can be shown to allow the Court, in its discretion, to extend the remaining deadlines as requested.

RICHARD HARRIS

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IV. PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETING DISCOVERY

Based on the foregoing, the proposed schedule for completing discovery is as follows:

Discovery Deadline	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Motion to Amend/Add Parties	No extension	No extension
Plaintiff's Initial Expert	02.12.2024	05.13.2024
Disclosures		
All Rebuttal Expert Disclosures	03.12.2024	06.10.2024
Discovery Cut-Off Date	04.11.2024	07.10.2024
Dispositive Motions	05.13.2024	08.12.2024

Dated this 29th day of January, 2024.

RICHARD HARRIS LAW FIRM

Dated this 29th day of January, 2024. CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY

/s/ Joel K. Browning

Jonathan B. Lee, Esq.
Nevada Bar Number 13524
801 South Fourth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated this 29th day of January, 2024.

TYSON & MENDES

/s/ Jonathan B. Lee

/s/ Russell D. Christian

Russell D. Christian, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 11785 2835 St. Rose Parkway, Suite 140

Henderson, Nevada 89052

21 Attorneys for Defendant,

Preventive Measures Security Firm, LLC

Joel K. Browning, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 14489
500 South Grand Central Parkway, Suite 5075
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155

Attorneys for Defendant, Clark County

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED subject to the following modification. The parties' proposed schedule fails to include a deadline for filing their joint pretrial order. Accordingly, the deadline to file the Joint Pretrial Order is **September 11, 2024.** If dispositive motions are filed, the deadline for filing the joint pretrial order will be suspended until 30 days after decision on the dispositive motions or further court order.

DATED this 31st day of January 2024.

DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7