

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**

THOMAS WALKER, et al.,)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01475-JAD-NJK
Plaintiff(s),)	ORDER
vs.)	(Docket No. 150)
CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, et al.,)	
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs’ renewed motion for an order fixing expert witness fees. Docket No. 150. The Court denied Plaintiffs’ initial motion because it failed to show that “[a] pre-filing conference between counsel that includes personal consultation” had been conducted. Docket No. 146 (citing Local Rule 26-7(c) and Local Rule IA 1-3(f)). Plaintiffs’ renewed motion indicates that their counsel sent a letter to opposing counsel and that a responsive letter has been received. Docket No. 150-1 at ¶¶ 10, 14. As the previously cited rules make clear, the exchange of these letters is not sufficient to satisfy the pre-filing conference requirement because it lacks “personal consultation”:

Unless these rules or a court order provides otherwise, this requirement [to meet and confer] may only be satisfied through direct dialogue and discussion in a face-to-face meeting, telephone conference, or video exchange. **The exchange of written, electronic, or voice-mail communications does not satisfy this requirement.**

Local Rule IA 1-3(f) (emphasis added).

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

Because the renewed motion for an order fixing expert witness fees continues to fail to establish that a sufficient pre-filing conference was conducted, it is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 14, 2017



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge