

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**

PLATINUM REALTY AND HOLDINGS, LLC, )  
 )  
Plaintiff(s), )  
 )  
vs. )  
 )  
RANDALL M. LEE, et al., )  
 )  
Defendant(s). )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. 2:13-cv-00535-GMN-NJK  
ORDER  
(Docket No. 67)

Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend various deadlines. Docket No. 67. It appears that the extension requested was necessitated by the parties’ decision to forego their discovery obligations while they attempted to settle the case. Docket No. 67 at 2. The case law is abundantly clear that the parties’ decision to forego discovery while they attempt to settle a case is not good cause to extend deadlines in the scheduling order. *See, e.g., United States v. Jaynes Corp.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 82928, \*3 (D. Nev. June 22, 2015) (collecting cases). The parties further request an extension because a motion to dismiss is pending. Docket No. 67 at 2. However, a pending motion dispositive motion is an inadequate basis to stay or extend discovery. *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011) (“The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending”).

//  
//  
//

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

In light of the above, the pending stipulation is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 1, 2016



---

NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge