Wierzbowski	v. Steve Dec et al	Do	oc. 196
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
10	MIREK WIERZBOWSKI,	Case No. 2:13-cv-00076-JAD-NJK	
11	Plaintiff(s),	ORDER	
12	v.	(Docket No. 193)	
13	STEVE DEC,) 	
14	Defendant(s).))	
15	A 11 .1:	Commence of a set Continue the material Deals 20	
16	All discovery motions require a pre-filing conference and certification thereto. Local Rule 26-		
17 18	7(c). The pending motion to reopen discovery indicates that counsel "attempted to confer," received no response, but had previously been told via email that such a motion would be opposed. Docket No. 193		
19	at 1-2. In so doing, counsel has failed to satisfy the underlying meet-and-confer requirements, as well		
20	as the requirements to provide a detailed certification of the meet-and-confer process. <i>See</i> Local Rule		
21	26-7(c); see also Local Rule IA 1-3(f). Counsel shall review the applicable rules and continue the meet-		
22	and-confer efforts. Defense counsel shall promptly respond to the request to schedule the meet-and-		
23	confer.	T	
24	//		
25	//		
26	//		
27	//		
28	//		

Depending on the results of that process, Plaintiff shall file either a stipulation to reopen discovery or a renewed motion to reopen discovery in compliance with the rules, by May 31, 2017. If such a motion is filed, any response shall be filed within 5 court days of the filing of the motion and any reply shall be filed within 3 court days of the filing of the response.

The pending motion to reopen discovery is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 25, 2017

NANCY J. KOPPE

United States Magistrate Judge