

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**

HEATHER MILLS,)	Case No. 2:16-cv-00097-KJD-CWH
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
vs.)	
)	
WAL-MART STORES, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This matter is before the Court on the parties’ Proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (doc. # 9).

The Court has reviewed the parties’ discovery plan and finds that it does not comply with Local Rule 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.” Loc. R. 26-1(e)(1). Additionally, parties that request a discovery period that is longer or different must state on the face of their discovery plan, in bold type, that it is “SUBMITTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH LR 26-1(e)” and “SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED.” Loc. R. 26-1(d). Parties must also provide “a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case.” Loc. R. 26-1(d).

Here, the parties fail to comply with the discovery plan format, and request 205 days to complete discovery without providing any reasons why the extended discovery period is necessary.

Accordingly, the parties’ Proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (doc. # 9) is **denied without prejudice**.

DATED: March 9, 2016


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