

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**

ROBERT JOHNSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
WHIRLPOOL CORPORATION,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cv-02425-JCM-CWH

ORDER


Presently before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to compel (ECF No. 38), filed on February 1, 2017. Defendant has not filed a response.

Under Local Rule 26-7(b), all motions to compel discovery must set forth in full the text of the discovery originally sought and any response to it. Local Rule 26-7(c) further requires that motions to compel will not be considered unless they include a declaration setting forth the details and results of the meet and confer conference for each disputed discovery request.

Plaintiff has included a certification of a the attempts to meet and confer. However, he has not provided details of the results of the conference for any of the disputed discovery requests. In order to determine the nature and extent of the remaining dispute, the Court requires a description of each disputed discovery request along with an explanation of the status of the dispute after the meet and confer conferences.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion to compel (ECF No. 38) is DENIED without prejudice.

DATED: February 2, 2017.



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