

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**

PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE )  
COMPANY, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
vs. )  
 )  
ROBERT HORNBUCKLE, GEORGE THOMAS, )  
and LORA WRIGHT )  
 )  
Defendants. )

Case No. 2:13-cv-02293-GMN-NJK  
ORDER

Pending before the Court is the parties’ Stipulation and Order to Continue Discovery, filed on June 13, 2014. *See* Docket No. 20. Therein, the parties seek to extend certain discovery deadlines established by the scheduling order in this case, which was approved by the Court on March 28, 2014. *See* Docket No. 14. One of the deadlines the parties seek to extend is the expert witness disclosure deadline, which is currently set to expire on June 24, 2014. *Id.*, at 2.

Local Rule 26-4 provides that any stipulation to extend a deadline shall include “(a) A statement specifying the discovery completed; (b) A specific description of the discovery that remains to be completed; (c) The reasons why the deadline was not satisfied or the remaining discovery was not completed within the time limits set by the discovery plan; and (d) A proposed schedule for completing all remaining discovery.” The parties’ stipulation does not contain this information. *See* Docket No. 20.


Local Rule 26-4 also requires that “[a]pplications to extend any date set by the discovery plan, scheduling order, or other order must ... be supported by a showing of good cause for the extension.” In addition, requests to extend made after the expiration of the subject deadline “shall not be granted

1 unless the movant demonstrates that the failure to act was the result of excusable neglect.” *Id.* The  
2 stipulation does not demonstrate why good cause exists in this instance to extend the deadlines  
3 established in the scheduling order. *See* Docket No. 20. Further, the parties have attempted to stipulate  
4 to an extension of the deadline for initial expert disclosures, but did not submit their request at least 21  
5 days prior to the expiration of the deadline. *Id.* The pending request provides only cursory discussion  
6 of why the deadline should be extended, *see id.*, at 2, which the Court finds insufficient to demonstrate  
7 excusable neglect.

8 Because the pending stipulation does not address the excusable neglect factors or a showing of  
9 good cause, and because the requirements of Local Rule 26-4(a-d) have not been met, the stipulation is  
10 hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: June 16, 2014.

13  
14  


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