

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**

BOBBY LEE MONTGOMERY,)	
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	Case No. 2:12-cv-0817-MMD-NJK
)	
vs.)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART
)	MOTION TO EXTEND
LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE)	
DEPARTMENT, et al.,)	(Docket No. 51)
)	
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time to respond to discovery. Docket No. 51. Defendants filed a response indicating that they do not oppose an extension, but arguing that the length of extension sought was excessive. Docket No. 54. For good cause shown, the Court hereby **EXTENDS** the deadline for Plaintiff to respond to discovery as follows:

- Plaintiff must respond to the requests for admission no later than March 18, 2014;
- Plaintiff must respond to the interrogatories no later than March 28, 2014; and
- Plaintiff must respond to the requests for production of documents no later than March 28, 2014.

In addition to the above, the Court notes that Plaintiff did not confer with Defendants’ counsel regarding the extension he sought. The Court advises Plaintiff that discovery issues are generally resolved by the parties themselves without Court intervention. If issues related to discovery arise in the future, Plaintiff should contact Defendants’ counsel in an attempt to reach an

1 agreement prior to filing a motion with the Court. *See* Local Rule 26-7(b). Only in the event that
2 Plaintiff and Defendants' counsel cannot resolve the issue on their own should they file a motion
3 seeking relief from the Court.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: February 25, 2014

6 
7 _____
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28