1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 5 LHF PRODUCTIONS, INC., 6 7 Plaintiff(s), Case No. 2:16-cv-00924-GMN-NJK 8 VS. **ORDER** QUINTON BRITTON, et al., 10 Defendant(s). 11 12 Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated proposed discovery plan and scheduling 13 order. Docket No. 28. The dates in the proposed discovery plan exceed the presumptively 14 reasonable time limits set forth in the Local Rules by approximately six months. See LR 26-1(b). 15 Additionally, if the parties need extra time for discovery, they must request special scheduling review and explain why longer or different time periods should apply to the case. See LR 26-1(a). 16 17 Finally, the plan does not contain a certification that the parties discussed whether they intend to 18 present evidence in electronic format to jurors for the purposes of jury deliberations. See LR 26-19 1(b)(9). 20 Accordingly, the Court hereby **DENIES** the parties' stipulated proposed discovery plan and 21 scheduling order (Docket No. 28). The parties shall file a new stipulated proposed discovery plan 22 and scheduling order that complies with the Local Rules, no later than November 4, 2016. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 DATED: October 28, 2016 25 NANCY J. KOPPE 26 United States Magistrate Judge 27 28