

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**

BRYAN CORNELL,	)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01906-APG-NJK
	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	ORDER
vs.	)	(Docket No. 47)
JOHN BONAVENTURA, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendant(s).	)	

Pending before the Court is a proposed discovery plan that was filed by certain Defendants. Docket No. 47. The discovery plan is hereby DENIED without prejudice. See Local Rule 26-1(d) (discovery plans must be submitted jointly); see also Docket No. 46 (requiring filing of a “joint” discovery plan).<sup>1</sup> The parties must, no later than May 8, 2015, either show cause in writing why they failed to timely file a proper discovery plan or they must file a proper joint discovery plan. See Docket No. 46.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 4, 2015

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 NANCY J. KOPPE  
 United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> In addition, as this Court has explained previously to Mr. Pool, Local Rule 26-4 was modified approximately four years ago. See *McMillen v. Las Vegas Township Constable’s Office*, Case No. 2:14-cv-780-APG-NJK, Docket No. 43 (July 28, 2014). The proposed discovery plan misstates the deadline outlined in Local Rule 26-4 for seeking extensions. Docket No. 47 at 3. The Court again urges Mr. Pool to become familiar with the Local Rules and to ensure that his filings comport with them.