

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

10 TRACY MEADOWS,

)

2:14-cv-02188-JAD-CWH

11

Plaintiffs,

)

vs.

)

ORDER

12

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

)

13

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,

)

et al.,

)

14

Defendants.

)

15

)

)

)

)

16

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Discovery Deadlines (doc. # 35), filed November 3, 2015, and Defendants' response (doc. # 36), filed November 4, 2015.¹

17

18

In her motion, Plaintiff asks the Court to extend discovery deadlines by 60 days because of scheduling issues arising from her counsel's case load.

19

20

Defendants, in response, oppose Plaintiff's request, but state that they would be willing to extend discovery by 30 days and to extend the deadline for responses to interrogatories and document requests by 14 days. Defendants explain that Plaintiff's counsel was "undoubtedly aware" of the trial date in his other case because that date was set three months ago and therefore counsel should have allowed sufficient time to manage trial preparation in that case while managing discovery deadlines in this case. Defendants next point out that a 30-day extension of discovery

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

¹ Also before the Court is a letter from defense counsel, faxed directly to this Court's chambers, informing the Court that all parties will be at the federal courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada, for a deposition on November 9, 2015. Given such, the parties ask the Court to consider hearing Plaintiff's motion on that day. Because the Court addresses Plaintiff's motion in the instant order, the request for a motion hearing is **denied as moot**.

28

1 would result in a discovery cut-off in February 2016, which would accommodate Plaintiff's
2 counsel's three-week trial in November 2015 for the other case, and would allow sufficient time for
3 the completion of discovery in this case. Defendants also point out that a 14-day extension for
4 responses to interrogatories and document requests is appropriate because Plaintiff has denied nearly
5 every request of Defendants' propounded requests for admissions. As such, the answers to
6 Defendants' interrogatories and document requests would allow Defendants to ascertain the factual
7 basis for Plaintiff's denials. Defendants further argue that requiring them to wait another two
8 months would prevent them from obtaining crucial information. Finally, Defendants point out that
9 Plaintiff fails to demonstrate excusable neglect to explain why a 60-day extension of discovery is
10 warranted in this case.

11 The Court has reviewed the parties' arguments and agrees with Defendants. As such, the
12 Court denies the instant motion.

13 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Discovery
14 Deadlines (doc. # 35) is **denied**.

15 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Court **adopts** Defendants' proposal to extend
16 discovery by 30 days and to extend the deadline for responses to interrogatories and document
17 requests by 14 days.

18 DATED: November 6, 2015

19 
20 _____
21 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**
22 **United States Magistrate Judge**

23
24
25
26
27
28