

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**

WILLIAM J. SMITH,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. 2:13-cv-0551-JAD-NJK
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY PLAN
	)	(Docket No. 13)
AMERICAN FAMILY MUTUAL INSURANCE,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan and scheduling order (Docket No. 13), which is hereby DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall submit a revised discovery plan, no later than September 11, 2013, that complies with the Local Rules. Specifically, the parties are requesting a discovery period approximately five months longer than the typical 180 days from when the first defendant answered. Therefore, the Discovery Plan must state on its face "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED" and the parties must provide "a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case . . ." See LR 26-1(d).

Further, the Rule 26(f) conference was required to be held within 30 days of April 1, 2013, when the first Defendant filed its Answer, and the stipulated discovery plan was due 14 days thereafter. See Local Rule 26-1(d). Absent a motion to stay, the Discovery Plan is approximately 4 months late. Accordingly, the parties must show excusable neglect for their substantial delay in filing the Proposed Discovery Plan with the Court. LR 26-4.

...

1 Finally, requests to extend discovery deadlines must be filed at least 21 days before the  
2 expiration of the subject deadline sought to be extended. The pending proposed discovery plan  
3 incorrectly states that dates in the discovery plan and scheduling order may be modified up to 20 days  
4 before the discovery cut-off.

5 Although the Court is inclined to approve the deadlines set out in the parties' proposed  
6 discovery plan, the parties must comply with the Local Rules and must provide sufficient reasons for  
7 their delayed filing. In the future, the Court expects counsel to comply with the deadlines set out in  
8 Local Rule 26-1(d) unless a stay of discovery is approved by the Court.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: September 5, 2013

11  
12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 NANCY J. KOPPE  
15 United States Magistrate Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28