

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**

CLAUDIA CRUZ-AGUILAR,	)	
	)	Case No. 2:15-cv-01965-APG-CWH
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
WAL-MART SUPERCENTER,	)	
d/b/a Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

This matter is before the Court on the parties’ Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (doc. # 10), filed January 5, 2016.


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 stipulated that the 12-month discovery period would be measured from the date of their Rule 26(f) conference, rather than the date Defendant first appeared in this case. However, the parties fail to provide an explanation as to why a special scheduling review is required. The Court therefore finds that the parties have not provided a sufficient explanation to warrant an extended discovery period.

//

1           Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the parties' Joint Discovery Plan and  
2 Scheduling Order (doc. # 10) is **denied**. The parties are directed to file an amended discovery plan,  
3 **no later than January 14, 2016**, that complies with this Court's local rules.

4           DATED: January 7, 2016

5  
6             
7 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**  
8 **United States Magistrate Judge**