

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

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING, P.C.,)	Case No. 2:15-cv-00701-JCM-NJK
Plaintiff(s),)	
vs.)	ORDER DENYING PROPOSED
TERRY DORFMAN, et al.,)	DISCOVERY PLAN
Defendant(s).)	(Docket No. 19)

Pending before the Court is a proposed discovery plan (Docket No. 19) which, for the reasons set forth below, is **DENIED** without prejudice. First, Local Rule 26-1(e)(1) establishes 180 days, measured from the date the first defendant answers or otherwise appears, as a presumptively reasonable time to complete discovery. Where more than 180 days of discovery are sought, the proposed discovery plan must state on its face, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED" and provide an explanation why the parties believe additional time is required. Local Rule 26-1(d). In this case, the proposed discovery plan requests a longer discovery period than 180 days without complying with Local Rule 26-1.

Second, the proposed discovery plan misstates Local Rule 26-4, in that it provides that requests to extend deadlines in the scheduling order need only be filed 21 days before the discovery cut-off. See Docket No. 19, at 3. 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. For example, any request to extend the deadline for initial expert disclosures must be filed at least 21 days before the expiration of that deadline. Such a request filed only 21 days before the discovery cut-off would be untimely.

