Cooper et al v. Cl	ark County Nevada et al	Doc.	110 .
1	STEVEN B. WOLFSON		
1	District Attorney		
2	CIVIL DIVISION State Bar No. 001565		
3	By: ROBERT T. WARHOLA Deputy District Attorney		
4	500 South Grand Central Pkwy. P. O. Box 552215		
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2215		
6	(702) 455-4761 Fax (702) 382-5178		
7	Email: Robert. Warhola@clarkcountyda.com Attorneys for Defendants		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
9	DAVID COOPER, ET AL.,		
10	}	Case No: 2:10-CV-0763-KJD- GWF	
11	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO	
12	vs.	FILE REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY	
13	CLARK COUNTY NEVADA, ET AL.,	JUDGMENT (First Request)	
14	Defendants.		
15			
16	Defendants, through undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully requests that this Court		
17	issue an Order granting an extension of time of seven (7) days, until Wednesday June 25,		
	2014, for Defendants to file their reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion for Summary		
18	Judgment (#90), which is presently due on June 18, 2014.		
19	DATED this 16th day of June, 2014.		
20	STEVEN B. WOLFSON		
21	DISTRICT ATTORNEY		
22	* Darkos		
23	By: ROBERT T. WARHOLA		
24	Deputy District Attorney		
25	State Bar No. 004410 500 South Grand Central Pkwy.		
26	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2215		
	Attorneys for Defendants		
27			
28			
	1 of	73	

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

On April 29, 2014, the Court struck the parties filings relating to Clark County's first Motion for Summary Judgment. (doc # 86). The Court gave the Defendants until May 14, 2014 to file "a single procedurally and substantively correct and complete Motion for Summary Judgment." *Order*, (doc # 86), p. 2:17-18. The Court gave the Plaintiffs until May 28, 2014 to file "a single procedurally and substantively correct and complete response." *Id.*, p. 2:19-20.

On May 14, 2014, Clark County filed its revised Motion for Summary Judgment. (doc. #87). On May 28, 2014, the Court granted the Plaintiffs an extension of time to June 11, 2014 to file their opposition brief and ordered that Clark County's reply, if any, be filed by June 18, 2014. *Order*, (doc. #89, p. 2:6).

The undersigned has good cause for this request for an extension of time. The undersigned has prior scheduling commitments, namely, hearings before the Clark County Commission and Clark County Planning Commission on the afternoon and evening of Tuesday, June 17, 2014 and all day Wednesday, June 18, 2014. The undersigned counsel was also out-of-town Father's Day weekend, including all day Friday, June 13, 2014, on a previously scheduled trip. The prior scheduled commitments interfere with his ability to complete Defendants' reply by the June 18, 2014 deadline.

Additionally, Plaintiffs' Opposition (#90) is sixty-three (63) pages in length, that is, more than double the length permitted by Local Rule 7-4, and sixteen (16) pages longer than the opposition Plaintiffs filed in response to Defendants' original motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs have attached approximately 1,088 pages of exhibits to their recent Opposition which appears to be substantially longer than the documentation Plaintiffs filed separately in support of their original opposition. The new material and documents require additional time to review and research in order to provide a response.

This request is not made for the purpose of delay or in bad faith or for any other dilatory purpose.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b), an extension of time may be granted 1 on a showing of good cause. This is Defendants' first request for an extension of time to file 2 their reply to Plaintiffs' revised Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment. 3 None of the parties will be prejudiced by the granting of this motion. 4 On June 16, 2014, the undersigned contacted counsel for Plaintiffs, Ms. Lisa 5 Rasmussen, who stated that she would not oppose Defendants' request for an extension of 6 7 time until June 25, 2014. WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that this Court grant a seven (7) day 8 extension of time, until Wednesday, June 25, 2014, for Defendants to file their reply to 9 Plaintiffs' revised Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment. 10 11 DATED this _____day of June, 2014. 12 STEVEN B. WOLFSON, 13 DISTRICT ATTORNEY 14 15 By: 16 Deputy District Attorney Attorneys for Defendants 17 18 19 IT IS SO ORDERED: 20 21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 22 DATED: June 16, 2014 23 24 25 26 27

28