

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**

PAIGE ANN ARCURI,)
)
 Plaintiff(s),)
)
 vs.)
)
 STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE)
 INSURANCE COMPANY, et al.,)
)
 Defendant(s).)
 _____)

Case No. 2:13-cv-00416-GMN-NJK
**ORDER DENYING AMENDED
PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN**
(Docket No. 15)

On May 7, 2013, the Court denied the parties’ initial proposed discovery plan based on a number of deficiencies. Docket No. 14. Those deficiencies included:

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. . . . Third, requests for extending discovery deadlines must be filed no later than 21 days before the subject deadline sought to be extended. *See* Local Rule 26-4. The submitted discovery plan misstates Local Rule 26-4.

Docket No. 14. Despite the Court’s order that the parties file another proposed discovery plan that complies with the Local Rules, the amended proposed discovery plan failed to remedy the above deficiencies. Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan is **DENIED**. The parties are ordered, no later than May 20, 2013, to file another proposed discovery plan that complies with the Local Rules.¹

¹ The Court reminds the parties that they are required to comply with the Local Rules and Court orders. Future failure to do so may result in sanctions. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f); Local Rule IA 4-1.

1 The Court finds that good cause exists to have a discovery period beyond the presumptively
2 reasonable 180-day period. As such, the second amended proposed discovery plan may be based on
3 the parties' proposed discovery cut-off of November 18, 2013.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: May 13, 2013

6
7 
8 _____
9 NANCY J. KOPPE
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28