

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**

MAX RUHLMAN, et al.,)	Case No. 2:14-cv-00879-RFB-NJK
Plaintiff(s),)	
v.)	ORDER
GLENN RUDOLFSKY, et al.,)	(Docket No. 193)
Defendant(s).)	

On April 24, 2017, Plaintiffs filed a motion to compel and for sanctions, including case-dispositive sanctions. Docket No. 182. On May 11, 2017, Defendants filed a defective response. First, the response is untimely. The Court denied the previous stipulation to extend, and a further request was not made. Instead, Defendants indicate in a footnote that “[a] motion will be filed promptly to extend.” *Id.* at 1 n.1. The time for seeking an extension to a briefing deadline is *before* the brief is filed, not after. Second, the response lacks any citation to any legal authority, which the Court may construe in its discretion to be consent to the granting of the motion. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d). Given the important issues at stake, including possible case-dispositive sanctions, the Court will instead permit Defendants an opportunity to file a proper responsive brief.

//
//
//
//

