



1 The parties next rely on the fact that two defendants have yet to appear. Docket No. 13 at 2. Local  
2 Rule 26-1(e)(1), however, measures the discovery period from “the date the first defendant answers or  
3 appears[.]” Late appearances, therefore, are not incorporated into the measurement of the discovery period.

4 The last reason the parties provide is that the key witnesses are involved in hundreds of cases and have  
5 limited availability. Docket No. 13 at 2. The Court has previously rejected this reason for a longer discovery  
6 period. *See, e.g., First Horizon Home Loans v. Day Dawn Crossing Homeowners Association*, Case No.  
7 2:15-cv-1262-JAD-NJK (D. Nev. Sept. 17, 2015) (Docket No. 19)

8 Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice. The parties shall file,  
9 no later than April 26, 2016, an amended joint proposed discovery plan submitted in compliance with Local  
10 Rule 26-1(e)(1).

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: April 19, 2016

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 NANCY J. KOPPE  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28