

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**

JANE DOE, an individual,
Plaintiff,
vs.
RICHARD ROE, an individual,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01644-MMD-GWF
ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the parties’ failure to file a proposed Stipulated Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order. A Report of the Parties’ Planning Meeting (#50) was filed on December 31, 2013. The Court had granted a temporary stay of discovery allowing the parties to conduct a mediation. The second of two settlement conferences was conducted on December 10, 2013, but no settlement was reached. The parties advised a case planning conference was conducted as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f); however, the parties did not file the mandatory stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. LR 26-1(e)(1) provides that unless otherwise ordered, discovery periods longer than one hundred eighty (180) days from the date the first defendant answers or appears will require special scheduling review. LR 26-1(d) states that if longer deadlines are sought, the plan shall state on its face “SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED.” Where such special scheduling review is requested, the plan shall state the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties shall, within ten (10) days of the date of this order, either submit a proposed discovery plan in compliance with LR 26-1(e), or a proposed plan
...

1 stating on its face "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED" and setting forth therein
2 the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply.

3 DATED this 2nd day of January, 2014.

4
5 
6 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
7 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28