Defendants.

JAVIER LOPEZ,

8 vs.

//

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Plaintiff,

Vs.

ORDER DENYING PROPOSED
DISCOVERY PLAN (Docket No. 10)

STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE
INSURANCE COMPANY, et al.,

DENIED. The proposed discovery plan is deficient in a number of respects. First, the Local Rules require proposed discovery plans to "state the date the first defendant answered or otherwise appeared." Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The submitted discovery plan fails to do so. Second, where deadlines beyond those listed in Local Rule 26-1 are sought, "the plan shall state on its face "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." Local Rule 26-1(d). The proposed discovery plan seeks extended deadlines but does not provide this statement. Third, the presumptive discovery period is 180 days from the date the first defendant answers. Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The proposed plan seeks additional time by calculating the 180-day period as commencing from the date of the Rule 26-1 conference and the only reason provided for doing so is "to ensure sufficient time to conduct all necessary discovery." *See* Docket No. 10 at 1. This is not a sufficient reason for an extension of the discovery period. Lastly, the discovery plan must be submitted 14 days after the Rule 26 conference (Local Rule 26-1(d)), which occurred in this case on January 16, 2013. Nonetheless, the parties filed their proposed discovery plan 16 days later, on February 1, 2103, with no explanation for the delay.

Pending before the Court is the proposed discovery plan (Docket No. 10), which is hereby

Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan is **DENIED**. The parties are ordered, no later than February 6, 2013, to file another proposed discovery plan based on the 180-day discovery period outlined in Local Rule 26-1(e)(1).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 4th day of February, 2013.

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge