

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**

KENNETH VENTRELLA,)
)
Plaintiff(s),)
)
vs.)
)
TRUMP RUFFIN TOWER I, LLC, et al.,)
)
Defendant(s).)
_____)

Case No. 2:12-cv-01450-LRH-NJK
**ORDER DENYING REQUEST
TO EXTEND DISCOVERY
DEADLINES (Docket No. 46)**


Pending before the Court appears to be a stipulation to extend discovery deadlines, *see* Docket No. 46 (“Second Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order”), which is hereby **DENIED**. The pending request has a number of deficiencies. First, a request to extend discovery deadlines shall be made by motion or stipulation. *See* Local Rule 26-4; *see also* Docket No. 30. The pending request is fashioned as a discovery plan. Second, requests for extension must be supported by a showing of good cause if filed more than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline, and by a showing of excusable neglect if filed less than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline. Local Rule 26-4; *see also* Docket No. 30. The pending request does not attempt to make such a showing.¹ Third, “[a]ny motion or stipulation to extend a deadline or to reopen discovery shall include[, *inter alia*,]: (a) A statement specifying the discovery completed; (b) A specific description of the discovery that remains to be completed; [and] (c) The reasons why the deadline was not satisfied or the remaining discovery was not completed within the time limits set by the discovery plan.” Local Rule 26-4; *see also* Docket No. 30. The pending request fails to do so.

¹ The pending request also misstates Local Rule 26-4's timing requirements for requesting an extension of discovery deadlines. *See* Docket No. 46 at 4.

1 The Court has already specifically reminded counsel of the above requirements. *See* Docket
2 No. 30. Nonetheless, counsel failed to take heed of these instructions. Counsel are again reminded
3 of these requirements and are hereby ORDERED to file any future requests for discovery-related
4 extensions in accordance with the requirements outlined above and in the Local Rules. Future
5 failure to abide by this Order or the Local Rules may result in the imposition of sanctions.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: March 11, 2013

8 
9 _____
10 NANCY J. KOPPE
11 United States Magistrate Judge