

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**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 2:12-cv-01916-JAD-GWF
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
WAYNE REEVES, et al.,)	Motion to Compel (#60)
Defendants.)	

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (#60), filed on November 7, 2013. Plaintiff represents it served Defendant Diane Vaoga (“Vaoga”) with a set of interrogatories on August 23, 2013. Under Rule 33(b)(2), Vaoga was required to respond by September 24, 2013. Plaintiff further represents that, to date, Vaoga has neither responded nor sought an extension of time to respond.

Rule 26(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a party may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense. For good cause, the court may broaden the scope of discovery to any matter relevant to the subject matter involved in the action. Relevant information need not be admissible at trial if the discovery appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Relevancy under Rule 26(b)(1) is liberally construed. *U.S. E.E.O.C. v. Caesars Entertainment, Inc.*, 237 F.R.D. 428, 431–32 (D.Nev. 2006). Indeed, Rule 26 encompasses “any matter that bears on, or that reasonably could lead to other matters that could bear on, any issue that is or may be in the case.” *Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders*, 437 U.S. 340, 351 (1978). Discovery is not limited to the issues raised only in the pleadings, but rather it is designed to define and clarify the issues. *See id.* at 351.

