

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**

JENNIFER KWASNIEWSKI, et al.,)	Case No. 2:12-cv-00515-GMN-NJK
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	ORDER
)	
vs.)	(Docket No. 177)
)	
SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S. LLC,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is Defendant’s motion for protective order regarding the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition currently noticed for January 4, 2017. Docket No. 177. As an initial matter, the motion seeks a continuance of the deposition and represents that Plaintiffs’ counsel is amenable to such continuance. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 177 at 3. Parties are permitted to stipulate to continuing a deposition without Court approval so long as doing so does not interfere with the schedule set by the Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 29. To the extent an agreed continuance does interfere with the schedule set by the Court, the parties should file a stipulation seeking Court approval. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 7-1. As such, the motion for protective order is **DENIED** as moot to the extent it seeks to continue the deposition date.¹ The parties shall agree to a new date among themselves and, if necessary under Rule 29, shall file a stipulation for Court approval by December 28, 2016.

¹ The remainder of the motion for protective order remains pending.

