

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**


JUSTIN M. CAHILL,)	
)	2:15-cv-00468-RFB-CWH
Plaintiff,)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
vs.)	
)	
LARRY A. KENT,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court on the parties’ Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (doc. # 10), filed April 15, 2015.

The Court has reviewed the proposed discovery plan and finds that it does not comply with Local Rule (“LR”) 26-1. Absent a court order, “discovery periods longer than one hundred eighty (180) days from the date the first defendant answers or appears will require special scheduling review.” LR 26-1(e)(1). Additionally, parties that request a discovery period that is longer or different must provide “a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case.” LR 26-1(d). Here, the parties request a special scheduling order with competing dates, but do not provide any reasons why an extended discovery period is necessary or why the parties cannot agree to the same discovery dates.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the parties’ Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (doc. # 10) is **denied**.

DATED: April 16, 2015



C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge