UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MIGUEL ORTIZ, Plaintiff(s), vs. PACIFIC UNION FINANCIAL, Defendant(s).	)	2:16-cv-00825-JCM-NJK **O R D E R**

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 24. The parties request a discovery period that is approximately 60 days longer than the presumptively reasonable period set forth in Local Rule 26-(b)(1) because of a pending motion to dismiss. *Id.* at 4. The mere pendency of a dispositive motion does not delay the parties' discovery obligations. *Cf. Little v. City of Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988).

Accordingly, the parties' stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order, Docket No. 24, is hereby **DENIED**. The parties shall submit a stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling order that complies with the Local Rules, no later than April 19, 2017.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 12, 2017.

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge