UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

EDWARD STOLZ, Plaintiff(s), vs. SAFECO INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA, Defendant(s).	Case No. 2:14-cv-02060-RFB-NJK ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY PLAN (Docket No. 25)

Pending before the Court is Defendant's proposed discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 25. The proposed discovery plan is deficient in numerous ways. First, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(d), the parties are to submit a stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order fourteen days after the mandatory Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) conference. In the pending proposed discovery plan and scheduling order, Defense counsel represents that they attempted to confer with *pro se* Plaintiff Edward Stolz, but that Plaintiff refused to agree to the proposed discovery plan. Docket No. 25, at 1.

Second, proposed discovery plans must state the date on which the first defendant answered or otherwise appeared. Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). Defendant failed to do so. Third, proposed discovery plans must include signature blocks that are not on a separate page. Local Rule 26-1(e)(7); Local Rule 6-2(a). Defendant included a signature block on a separate page. Docket No. 25, at 5.

Fourth, the proposed discovery misstates Local Rule 26-4, in that it provides that requests to extend deadlines in the scheduling order need only be filed 20 days before the discovery cut-off

or "within 20 days before the expiration of any extension thereof that may have been approved by the Court."[1] Docket No. 25, at 4. Local Rule 26-4 requires that any request to extend deadlines set forth in the scheduling order must be submitted at least 21 days before the subject deadline.

Accordingly, the proposed order (Docket No. 25) is **DENIED** without prejudice. Any renewed joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order must be filed no later than seven days after United States District Judge Richard F. Boulware rules on the undersigned's Report and Recommendation issued March 20, 2015, Docket No. 26, if Judge Boulware does not adopt the Report and Recommendation in full. In that instance, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to make himself available for the Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) conference.

In an effort to ensure future compliance and complete understanding of the Local Rules, the Court hereby **ORDERS** attorneys Megan Dorsey and Andrew Green to file certifications with the Court no later than March 30, 2015, indicating that they have read and comprehend Local Rules 26-4 and 26-1. Counsel are advised that similar violations in the future may result in the imposition of sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 23, 2015

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge

[1] On February 9, 2015, the Court specifically ordered Defendant to cite Local Rule 26-4 correctly in the refiled proposed joint discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 23.