Lee et al v. Marten Transport, Ltd. et al

Doc. 66

corporation,	LOUIS	M.	PLASCENCIA,	
and DOES I through XXX, inclusive				)
	Defend	ants.		

## STIPULATION TO RE-FILE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT REGARDING PUNITIVE DAMAGES AND EXTEND BRIEFING SCHEDULE (Second Request)

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by Plaintiffs and Defendants, through their undersigned counsel, that the Defendants be granted an extension until April 11, 2017 to re-file their Motions for Summary Judgment regarding Punitive Damages (Docket Numbers 55 and 57) to comply with this Honorable Court's Local Rules pertaining to page limits, and to extend the briefing schedule with respect to those motions. In support of their stipulations, the parties state as follows:

## INTRODUCTION

On August 23, 2016, this Honorable Court entered an order granting the parties' Stipulation to Extend Discovery Deadlines. (Doc. No. 27.) Pursuant to the August 23, 2016 Stipulation and Order, the deadline for filing dispositive motions was extended for the first time from December 14, 2016, to March 14, 2017.

On March 14, 2017, both plaintiffs and defendants filed dispositive motions. Specifically, the plaintiffs filed a motion for partial summary judgment on the issues of willful and wanton conduct and the defendants' affirmative defenses and counterclaim for contribution. (Doc. No. 53.) The defendants filed three motions for summary judgment with respect to the following: (1) the plaintiffs' intentional infliction of emotional distress claims (Doc. No. 56); (2) the plaintiffs' claims for punitive damages against Louis Plascencia (Doc. No. 57); and (3) the plaintiffs' claims for negligent hiring and supervision and punitive

damages against Marten Transport, Ltd. (Doc. No. 55.) Pursuant to Local Rule 7-2, the Notice of Electronic Filing for all of the above-referenced motions provided that response briefs were due on April 4, 2017.

On April 4, 2017, the parties reached a stipulation – as detailed below – to resolve the plaintiffs' negligence and punitive damages claims against Marten Transport, Ltd., arising out of its hiring and supervision of Louis Plascencia, based on Marten Transport, Ltd.'s admission that Louis Plascencia was acting within the course and scope of his employment at the time of the subject occurrence. As such, the plaintiffs stipulate to dismiss one count of their complaint – as detailed below – thereby rendering moot the corresponding aspects of the defendants' motions for summary judgment. At the same time, the plaintiffs raised an issue with respect to the defendants' compliance with this Honorable Court's local rules regarding page limits, Local Rule 7-3, which the parties seek to remedy with the following stipulation.

## STIPULATION

The parties stipulate as follows:

- 1. The Defendants, Louis Plascencia and Marten Transport, Ltd., admit that Louis Plascencia was acting within the course and scope of his employment with Marten Transport, Ltd., at the time of the subject occurrence on February 21, 2015.
- 2. The parties stipulate that the foregoing admission of the Defendants does not bear in any fashion on whether Marten Transport, Ltd., ratified any conduct of Louis Plascencia with respect to the subject occurrence.
- 3. Based on the foregoing stipulation of the Defendants, the Plaintiffs stipulate to dismiss with prejudice their claims for negligent hiring and supervision against Marten Transport, Ltd., (Count 15, paragraphs LXX-LXXI, of the Plaintiffs' Complaint) and their claims for punitive damages against Marten Transport, Ltd., solely to the extent that they arise out of any claims for hiring and supervision (Count 16, paragraphs LXXII-LXXVIII).

- 4. The above-stated stipulation does not affect in any way the remaining Counts of the Plaintiffs' Complaint (Counts 1-14, paragraphs I-LXIX), the Plaintiffs' claims for punitive damages against Louis Plascencia (Count 16, paragraphs LXXII-LXXVIII), and the Plaintiffs' claims for punitive damages against Marten Transport, Ltd., to the extent that those punitive damages claims against Marten Transport, Ltd., do not arise out of any claims for hiring and supervision (Count 16, paragraphs LXXII-LXXVIII).
- 5. Based on the foregoing admission and stipulation to dismiss the Plaintiffs' hiring and supervision claims against Marten Transport, Ltd., the Plaintiffs have no objection to the Defendants' having an extension until April 11, 2017, to re-file their motions for summary judgment regarding punitive damages (Docket Numbers 55 and 57) to comply with the Court's page limits.
- 6. In the event that the Court grants the Defendants leave until April 11, 2017 to re-file their motions for summary judgment regarding punitive damages to comply with the Court's page limits (Docket Numbers 55 and 57), the parties agree that the Plaintiffs shall have until May 2, 2017 to respond to the Defendants' re-filed motions for summary judgment regarding punitive damages and the Defendants' already filed motion for summary judgment regarding intentional infliction of emotional distress (Docket Number 56), and the Defendants shall have until May 16, 2017 to file replies in support of their motions for summary judgment.
- 7. In the event that the Court denies the Defendants leave to re-file their motions for summary judgment regarding punitive damages to comply with the Court's page limits, the parties agree that the Plaintiffs shall have an extension of twenty one (21) days from the date of such denial to respond to the Defendants' motions for summary judgment regarding punitive damages (Docket Numbers 55 and 57) and the Defendants' already filed motion for summary judgment regarding intentional infliction of emotional distress (Docket Number 56), and the Defendants shall have fourteen (14) days thereafter to file replies in support of their motions for summary judgment.
- 8. The Plaintiffs will not assert any objection or argument with respect to the length of the two previously-filed motions for summary judgment regarding punitive damages on behalf of the defendants, specifically Docket Numbers 55 (54 pages) and 57 (34 pages).
- 9. This stipulation does not affect in any way the briefing schedule on the Plaintiffs' motion for sanctions (Docket Number 54), and the Plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judgment (Docket Number 53), the briefing schedules for which shall stand.

This is the second request to extend the deadline for filing dispositive motions, but the first request for an extension of time on the briefing schedule with respect to dispositive motions.

1	DATED this 4th day of April 2017	DATED this 4th day of April 2017	
2			
3	THE HUNT LAW GROUP, LLC	LAW OFFICES OF BRADLEY ELLEY	
4	/s/ Brian H. Myers	/s/ Bradley P. Elley	
5	BRIAN H. MYERS, ESQ. (Pro Hac Vice)	BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY, ESQ. 120 Country Club Drive, Suite 5	
6	BRIAN J. HUNT, ESQ.	Incline Village, Nevada 89451 Phone: 775-831-8800	
7	(Pro Hac Vice) 10 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1450	Attorney for Plaintiffs	
8	Chicago, Illinois 60603 Attorneys for Defendants, Marten	DATED this 4th day of April 2017	
9	Transport, Ltd., and Louis Plascencia	, ,	
10	DATED this 4th day of April 2017	LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM E. WEISS	
11	ALVERSON TAYLOR MORTENSEN		
12	& SANDERS	/s/ William E. Weiss	
13		WILLIAM E. WEISS, ESQ. 140 Geary Street, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor	
14	/a/ In mothers D. Orange	San Francisco, California 94108	
15	/s/ Jonathan B. Owens JONATHAN B. OWENS, ESQ.	Attorney for Plaintiffs	
16	Bar No. 007118 7401 West Charleston Boulevard		
17	Las Vegas, Nevada 89117		
18	Telephone: (702) 384-7000 Fax: (702) 385-7000		
19	Email: JOwens@Alversontaylor.com		
20	<u>ORDER</u>		
21	Upon Stipulation by counsel for the parties, and good cause appearing therefore, IT IS		
22	HEREBY ORDERED that the Stipulation to Re-File Motions for Summary Judgment Regarding		
23	Punitive Damages and Extend Briefing Schedule [63] hereinabove is hereby Granted.		
24	DATED this <u>14</u> day of <u>Apri</u>	.1 , 2017.	
25	·		
26			
27		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	