

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**

JAMES HENSLEY,)	Case No. 2:16-cv-00941-JCM-NJK
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	ORDER
)	
vs.)	
)	
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,)	(Docket No. 17)
)	
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is the parties’ joint proposed discovery plan. Docket No. 17. Discovery plans must “state the date the first defendant answered or otherwise appeared[.]” LR 26-1(b). Local Rule 26-1(b)(1) establishes 180 days, measured from that date, as the presumptively reasonable time in which to complete discovery. Where more than 180 days of discovery are sought, the proposed discovery plan must state on its face, “SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED” and provide an explanation why the parties believe additional time is required. LR 26-1(b).


Here, the parties measure the discovery period from the date of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) conference, not from the date Defendants first appeared. Docket No. 17 at 2. Therefore, they request a discovery period of longer than 180 days but fail to request special scheduling review and provide an explanation as to why the parties believe additional time for discovery is required.

//
//
//
//

1 Accordingly, the parties' joint proposed discovery plan is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.
2 The parties must file a new joint proposed discovery plan that complies in full with LR 26-1, no later
3 than June 14, 2016.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: June 10, 2016



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28