1	Marquiz Law Office		
2	Professional Corporation		
3	3088 Via Flaminia Court		
4	Henderson, NV 89052 Phone: (702) 263-5533		
5	Fax: (702) 263-5532		
6	Craig A. Marquiz, Esq. NV Bar #7437		
7	MarquizLaw@cox.net		
8	Justice Law Center		
9	1100 S. Tenth Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89104		
10	Phone: (702) 731-0000 Fax: (702) 974-4008		
11	Bret O. Whipple, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6168		
12	Alissa C. Engler, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11940		
13	admin@justice-law-center.com		
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
16	DISTRICT		
16 17	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF	
	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom		
17	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff;		
17 18	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; Plaintiffs,		
17 18 19	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; Plaintiffs, V.	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF	
17 18 19 20	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; Plaintiffs,	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF STIPULATED REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING	
17 18 19 20 21	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF STIPULATED REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING DEADLINES AND JOINT REQUEST FOR REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF STIPULATED REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING DEADLINES AND JOINT REQUEST	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; Plaintiffs, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF STIPULATED REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING DEADLINES AND JOINT REQUEST FOR REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants,	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF STIPULATED REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING DEADLINES AND JOINT REQUEST FOR REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants,	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF STIPULATED REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING DEADLINES AND JOINT REQUEST FOR REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER (Fourth Request) ed. R. Civ. P. 6(b), the parties stipulate, subject	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	THE ESTATE OF BARRY ISOM, by and through its Executrix, Mary Love-Isom; Jaimee Isom Newberry and Kimberlee Isom Grindstaff; V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants, Pursuant to Local Rules 6-1, 26-4, and Fe	Case No.:2:14-cv-00475-JAD-VCF STIPULATED REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SCHEDULING DEADLINES AND JOINT REQUEST FOR REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER (Fourth Request) ed. R. Civ. P. 6(b), the parties stipulate, subject	

1	1. <u>Status Report</u> . This request is made 41 days before the current close of	
2	discovery, which is set for October 9, 2015. Pursuant to Local Rules 6-1(b) and 26-4, this request	
3	is timely in that it is made before the discovery cutoff. However, it is not timely in that it is made	
4	less than 21 days before the deadline of Plaintiff's Rebuttal Expert disclosures, which is set for	
5	September 4, 2015. As discussed more fully below, the parties' stipulation should still be	
6	approved because this stipulation is being filed six (6) days before the deadline. The Defendant's	
7	have produced a medical expert report for which Plaintiff's will require more than thirty (30)	
8	days to respond. Plaintiff's economic expert is also requiring a copy of Plaintiff's medical	
9	expert's rebuttal report, which will require more time as well. The Court granted the first,	
10	second, and third extensions of discovery deadlines in this case on January 12, 2015 (ECF No.	
11	27), April 24, 2015 (ECF No. 34), and July 22, 2015 (ECF No. 40).	
12	2. <u>Status/Discovery Completed</u> . On August 14, 2014, the parties held a conference	
13	pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P 26(f). On August 29, 2014, the Court entered a scheduling Order (ECF	
14	No. 21). Pursuant to the Scheduling Orders (ECF Nos. 27, 34, and 40) and Fed. R. Civ. P.	
15	26(a)(1), the parties exchanged initial disclosures and significant discovery has been completed,	
16	including the exchange of discovery requests, and the retention of experts.	
17	The parties have further completed the following discovery:	
18	• September 10, 2014: Defendant served Plaintiffs with interrogatories and requests for production.	
19 20	• October 31, 2014: Plaintiffs served responses to Defendant's interrogatories and requests for production.	
21	• November 20, 2014: Defendant and Plaintiffs met and conferred regarding	
22	Plaintiffs' responses.	
23	• December 8, 2014: Defendant's counsel and Defendant's accident reconstructionist consultant conducted an inspection of the motorcycle involved in the accident at issue in Panaca, Nevada.	
24 25	• December 11, 2014: Plaintiffs served some supplemental discovery responses in accordance with the parties' meet and confer.	
26	• December 26, 2014: Plaintiffs served Defendant with interrogatories and requests for production of documents.	
27 28	• December 2014-April 2015: Plaintiffs noticed the depositions of six (6) non-party witnesses.	
	- 2 -	

1 2	•	January 7, 2015: Defendant and Plaintiffs met and conferred regarding still outstanding supplemental discovery responses, including documentation of benefits provided to Plaintiffs' economist expert.
3	•	January 11, 2015: Plaintiffs deposed Vanessa Van Zerr, driver of the government vehicle.
4		January 12, 2015: Plaintiffs deposed Nelson Lau, passenger in the government
5		vehicle.
6	•	January 22, 2015: Plaintiffs deposed former Nevada Highway Patrol ("NHP") Officer John Cunag.
7 8	•	February 4, 2015: Defendant served discovery responses and its Third Supplemental Disclosures.
9	•	February 18, 2015: Defendant served supplemental discovery responses.
10	•	March 12, 2015: Plaintiffs deposed Irini Lamkin, passenger in the government vehicle.
11	•	March 17, 2015 and March 30, 2015: Defendant emailed Plaintiffs' counsel
12		regarding the status of supplemental discovery responses.
13	•	March 31, 2015: Defendant served its Fourth Supplemental Disclosures.
14	•	April 14, 2015: Plaintiffs served their Fourth Supplemental Disclosures.
15	•	April 20, 2015: Plaintiffs served their Fifth Supplemental Disclosures.
16	•	April 23, 2015: Plaintiffs deposed NHP Officer Alan Davidson.
17	•	May 19, 2015: Defendant deposed Plaintiff Mary Love-Isom.
18	•	May 21, 2015: Defendant deposed Plaintiff Jaimee Newberry.
19	•	June 3, 2015: Defendant deposed Plaintiff Kimberlee Grindstaff.
20	•	June 26, 2015: Plaintiffs served Defendant with their Expert Witness Disclosure Statement and Reports.
21 22	•	August 10, 2015: Defendant served Plaintiffs with their Expert Witness Disclosure Statement and Reports.
23		
24	3.	Discovery remaining . The parties' remaining discovery is limited to Plaintiff's
25	Expert Rebutta	al reports currently due on September 4, 2015.
	4.	Reasons for extension. Plaintiff was not anticipating a Medical Exert Report
26 27	from Defendant's, therefore, did not have a medical expert of their own lined up to prepare a	
27	rebuttal report	. The parties are requesting an additional thirty (30) days for the remaining rebuttal
28		
		- 3 -

1	expert disclosure deadlines, and do not seek to change any other remaining discovery deadlines.
2	The parties stipulate to this extension in good faith and not for the purpose of unnecessarily
3	delaying the proceedings.

4	5. <u>Revised discovery schedule</u> . ¹ The parties stipulate and agree to the following
5	revised discovery plan and ask that the Court adopt it as the revised scheduling order in this case.
6	A. <u>Expert Rebuttal Disclosures</u> : Plaintiffs' expert disclosures were served
7	on June 26, 2015. Defendant's expert disclosures were served on August 10, 2015; and Plaintiffs
8	may provide solely contradictory or rebuttal expert disclosures by October 4, 2015, which is 5
9	days before discovery cutoff.
10	DATED this 28 th day of August, 2015.
11	DANIEL G. BOGDEN JUSTICE LAW CENTER
12	United States Attorney MARQUIZ LAW OFFICE, PC
13	/s/ Krystal J. Rosse /s/ Alissa C. Engler,
14	BLAINE T. WELSH, ESQ.BRET O. WHIPPLE, ESQ.KRYSTAL J. ROSSE, ESQ.CRAIG MARQUIZ, ESQ.KRYSTAL J. ROSSE, ESQ.CRAIG MARQUIZ, ESQ.
15	ALISSA C. ENGLER, EŠQ.
16	IT IS SO ORDERED
17	IT IS SO OKDEREN
18	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19	DATED:
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	¹ Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(C) deadlines falling on a weekend or legal holiday "run until the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday"
	- 4 -