

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

\* \* \*

KEITH ALAN LASKO,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	2:13-cv-01893-JAD-NJK
vs.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
AMERICAN BOARD OF SURGERY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

Before the Court is *pro se* Plaintiff Keith Alan Lasko’s Motion for Discovery with Interrogatories and Request for Documents, Docket No. 108.<sup>1</sup>

**I. DISCUSSION**

A party “may not seek discovery from any source before the parties have conferred as required by Rule 26(f), except in a proceeding exempted from initial disclosure under Rule 26(a)(1)(B), or when authorized by these rules, by stipulation, or by court order.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d); *see also, e.g., First Option Mortg. LLC v. Tabbert*, 2012 WL 1669430, at \*1 (D. Nev. May 11, 2012). Upon a showing of good cause, a court may permit expedited discovery before the Rule 26(f) conference. *Id.* Good cause exists “where the need for expedited discovery, in consideration for the administration of justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party.” *Id.* (*quoting American LegalNet, Inc. v. Davis*, 673 F. Supp.2d 1063, 1066 (C.D. Cal. 2009)).

---

<sup>1</sup>  
Assuming discovery is authorized to commence, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not require litigants to file Motions with the Court to issue interrogatories or requests for production. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33, 34.

1           There is no record of the parties having conferred as required by Rule 26(f). Plaintiff,  
2 therefore, may not seek discovery from any source.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, Plaintiff's Motion fails to set  
3 forth any reason, much less good cause, for the Court to order discovery before the Rule 26(f)  
4 conference. Absent any stipulation between the parties allowing for discovery, the Court must  
5 accordingly deny Plaintiff's Motion to seek discovery at this juncture.

6 **II. CONCLUSION**

7           Based on the foregoing, and good cause appearing therefore,

8           **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery with Interrogatories  
9 and Request for Documents is **DENIED**.

10           **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties must submit either a joint proposed  
11 discovery plan and scheduling order in compliance with the Local and Federal Rules, or a request  
12 to stay discovery, citing the proper standards, no later than May 12, 2014.

13           DATED: April 30, 2014.

14 

15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 NANCY J. KOPPE  
17 United States Magistrate Judge

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>2</sup>

28           The Court liberally construes Lasko's claims. *See Bernhardt v. Los Angeles Cnty.*, 339 F.3d 920, 925 (9th Cir. 2003) (acknowledging that courts must construe *pro se* motions and pleadings liberally). Nevertheless, "*Pro se* litigants must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants." *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1986).