

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

ROBERT JOSEPH McCARTY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JOHN V. ROOS, et al.,

Defendants.

2:11-cv-001538-JCM-NJK

**AMENDED O R D E R**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty’s Motion for Immediate Specific Limited Discovery (#123). The Plaintiff has requested, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1)(B), that the Court compel the Defendants to provide the Plaintiff with “all Department of State and Department of Justice Files related to the Plaintiff to include, but not limited to, all copies of responses regarding the Plaintiff to members of Congress, Media, President, Vice President, etc.” Motion (#123) (emphasis removed). He has also requested “the most basic information.” *Id.*

The Plaintiff is correct that Rule 26 entitles parties to discovery; however, pursuant to Rule 26(d), neither party is generally required to provide any discovery until after the Rule 26(f) conference occurs. To date, no 26(f) conference has occurred nor has the Plaintiff shown good cause for why discovery should occur before the conference. Therefore, this request for discovery will be denied.<sup>1</sup>

The Plaintiff’s request is also denied for failure to comply with Fed.R.Civ.P. 37(a)(2)(B),

---

<sup>1</sup>Under LR 26-1(d), the Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) meeting must occur “within thirty (30) days after the first defendant answers or otherwise appears.” Then, “[f]ourteen (14) days after the mandatory Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) conference, the parties shall submit a stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order.” Accordingly, because the Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss on April 5, 2013, the Rule 26(f) conference should be forthcoming. The Court anticipates a Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order will be filed on or before May 19, 2013.

1 Fed.R.Civ.P. 34, and LR 26-7. Once discovery begins, the parties must meet and confer in good  
2 faith and attempt to resolve their discovery disputes before bringing the matter before the Court.  
3 See Fed.R.Civ.P. 37(a)(2)(B) and LR 26-7. Finally, requests for production must comply with  
4 Fed.R.Civ.P. 34. The Court finds that the Plaintiff's request does not meet these requirements.  
5 Accordingly, the Plaintiff's Motion (#123) shall be denied.

6 **CONCLUSION**

7 Based on the foregoing, and good cause appearing therefore,

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty's Motion for  
9 Immediate Specific Limited Discovery (#123) is DENIED.

10 DATED this 19th day of April, 2013

11  
12  
13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 NANCY J. KOPPE  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28