

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\*\*\*

LEMAR GRANT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BRIAN WILLIAMS, et al.,

Defendants.

2:16-cv-00011-JAD-VCF

**ORDER**

11 Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 49). Plaintiff is seeking  
12 a 45-day discovery extension and additional time to answer to Defendants' Interrogatories. Id.  
13 Defendants do not object. (ECF No. 50).

14 Accordingly,

15 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 49) is  
16 GRANTED. Plaintiff has until October 18, 2017 to answer Defendants' Interrogatories.

17 The following discovery deadlines apply:

- 18 1. Discovery cut-off: November 2, 2017  
19 2. Last day to file dispositive motions: December 4, 2017  
20 3. Date for filing Pretrial Order: January 3, 2018.

21 If dispositive motions are filed, the deadline for filing the joint pretrial order will be suspended  
22 until 30 days after decision on the dispositive motions or further court order.


23 On August 29, 2017, Plaintiff filed with the Court a request for production of documents. (ECF  
24 No. 52). Under LR 26-8, [u]nless the court orders otherwise, written discovery, including discovery  
25 requests, discovery responses, deposition notices, and deposition transcripts, must not be filed with the

1 court. Originals of responses to written discovery requests must be served on the party who served the  
2 discovery request, and that party must make the originals available at the pretrial hearing, at trial, or when  
3 ordered by the court. Pro se plaintiffs are held to a less stringent standard than those who are represented  
4 by counsel. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520, 92 S. Ct. 584 (1972). However, plaintiff is advised  
5 that he is still required to familiarize himself with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as well as the Local  
6 Rules of this court, and that a failure to comply with these rules could warrant future sanctions. See  
7 Jacobsen v. Filler, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364-65 (9th Cir. 1986) (holding that pro se parties are not excused  
8 from following the rules and orders of the court). Here, given that pro se Plaintiff is incarcerated and the  
9 means to serve Defendants with discovery is limited, Defendants are deemed served with Plaintiff's  
10 Request for Production of Documents (ECF No. 52). Defendants have until October 18, 2017 to respond  
11 to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents. In the future, Plaintiff must comply with LR 26-8.  
12 Written discovery must not be filed with the court and should be served directly on defendants.

13 The Clerk of Court is directed to strike Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents from the  
14 docket. (ECF No. 52).

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED this 18th day of September, 2017.

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 CAM FERENBACH  
20 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25