

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**

KENDALL HAUER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GEICO INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cv-02091-JAD-GWF

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendant’s Motion for Protective Order (ECF No. 13), filed on May 5, 2016. Also before the Court are Defendant’s Motion for Rule 35 Examination (ECF No. 16) and Motion to Extend Expert Deadlines (ECF No. 17), filed on May 10, 2016.

The meet and confer requirements in Rule 37(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule (“LR”) 26-7(b) require the moving party to confer or attempt to confer in person, or at least by telephone, with the opposing party in a good faith effort to resolve the discovery dispute prior to filing a motion to compel. *Shuffle Master v. Progressive Games*, 170 F.R.D. 166, 171 (D. Nev. 1996); *Walker v. North Las Vegas Police Depart.*, 2016 WL 427063, *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 3, 2016). Defendant’s Motion to Compel a Rule 35 Examination and Motion to Extend Expert Deadlines were filed without any apparent effort to meet and confer with Plaintiff in an attempt to resolve the disputes. Defendant’s Motion for Protective Order shows that the parties have communicated via e-mail regarding the dispute, but no in-person or telephonic communications were made. Because Defendant’s motions fail to show that it complied with the meet and confer requirements prior to filing the motion,

...
...
...
...

