27

vs.

DMWEST #16495247 v1

Counter/Cross-claimant,

Doc. 47

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

U.S. BANK N.A., SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE TO BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO LASALLE BANK N.A., AS TRUSTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE HOLDERS OF THE SHINGTON MUTUAL MORTGAGE PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATES. WMALT SERIES 2005-10; DAVID L. MCCOY, an individual; PAMELA MCCOY, an individual,

Counter/Cross-defendants.

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant U.S. Bank N.A., successor trustee to Bank of America, N.A., successor in interest to LaSalle Bank N.A., as trustee, on behalf of the holders of the Washington Mutual Mortgage Pass-Through Certificates, WMALT Series 2005-10 (the "Trustee") and Defendant Sherman Oaks Estates Owners Association ("Sherman Oaks") (collectively, the "Moving Parties") hereby submit this Joint Motion to Amend the Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order pursuant to LR 6-1 and 26-4.

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

#### I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

- The complaint was filed in this matter on December 6, 2016, and 1. service was effected on SFR and Sherman Oaks on December 13, 2016.
- On January 10, 2017, Sherman Oaks filed a motion to dismiss and a 2. motion for a more definitive statement. Trustee timely opposed those motions, and Sherman Oaks filed its replies in support on January 27, 2017.
- 3. On January 17, 2017, SFR filed a motion to certify a question of law to the Nevada Supreme Court, its answer, and a counterclaim against Trustee and David L. McCoy, the borrower under the note and deed of trust held by Trustee.
- 4. Trustee filed a timely opposition to SFR's motion to certify on January 31, 2017, and SFR filed its reply on February 3, 2017.

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

5.	Trustee	e repl	lied to	SFR's	count	ercla	aim on	Febru	ary 7	, 201	<b>7</b> .	Mr.
McCoy was	served	with	SFR's	counte	rclaim	on	Februa	ry 17,	2017,	but	has	not
answered or	otherwi	ise res	sponde	d.								

- 6. Thereafter the parties conferred and filed with the court a proposed discovery plan and scheduling order in compliance with Local Rule 26-1, setting July 10, 2017 as the discovery cutoff.
- 7. In compliance with the discovery plan and scheduling order, Sherman Oaks served its initial disclosures on March 14, 2017, and Trustee and SFR served their initial disclosures on March 24, 2017.

The Moving Parties have been diligently prosecuting this matter without intentional delays. However, the Moving Parties agree that an extension of the discovery deadline and corresponding deadlines is necessary and warranted. The early months of this case were consumed with motion practice on the Defendants' various motions and additional pleadings and, accordingly, discovery could not begin in earnest until the parties initial disclosures were produced by March 24, 2017, pursuant to the scheduling order. In responding to the discovery propounded to date, it has become clear the Moving Parties require additional time to provide complete and accurate discovery responses, and the discovery deadline now looms over the expected response timelines. To allow the parties to conduct complete discovery in this matter, the Moving Parties therefore request and stipulate to a 90 day extension of the current discovery deadline pursuant to Local Rule 7-1.

#### II. LOCAL RULE 26-4 REQUIREMENTS

#### Discovery Completed Α.

Sherman Oaks has completed the following:

- i. Service of its Initial Disclosures Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 26(a)(1);
- Production of Documents (100 pages, unstamped) ii.
- Service of its Interrogatories to Trustee; iii.

Trustee has completed the following:

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

i.	Service of its Initial Disclosures Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 26(a)(1)
ii.	Production of Documents USB-BS_000001 to USB-BS-000028
SFR	has completed the following:

- Service of its Initial Disclosures Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 26(a)(1); i.
- Production of Documents SFR0001 to SFR0253; ii.
- iii. Designation of expert witness;

#### В. Discovery to be Completed

The Moving Parties anticipate the following:

- i. Continued production of documents as they are located;
- ii. Designation of rebuttal expert witnesses, if any;
- iii. Service of additional Written Discovery, including Interrogatories, Requests for Production of Documents, and Requests for Admission;
- iv. Service of additional responses to Written Discovery, including Interrogatories, Requests for Production of Documents, and Requests for Admission;
- Issuance of Subpoenas Duces Tecum for relevant non-parties; v.
- vi. Scheduling of depositions for parties and relevant non-party witnesses.

#### C. Good Cause Exists for Extending Discovery Plan Deadlines

As detailed above, the early months of this case involved substantial briefing on dispositive motions, and the parties only began discovery in earnest after the service of initial disclosures on March 24, 2017. Trustee requires additional time to respond to discovery requests propounded by Sherman Oaks, and the Moving Parties anticipate additional time will be necessary to complete written discovery, schedule depositions of relevant witnesses, and seek further discovery from third parties. Accordingly, to permit the parties sufficient time to conduct meaningful

1	discovery, the Moving Parties agree it is necessary and beneficial to extend the
2	discovery deadline by 90 days.
3	D. <u>Proposed Schedule for Completing All Remaining Discovery</u>
4	By this Joint Motion, the Moving Parties seek to amend the schedule as set
5	forth on p. 3 of the Scheduling Order to extend the following deadlines by ninety
6	(90) days:
7	A. Discovery cutoff: Monday, October 9, 2017;
8	B. Dispositive motions: Tuesday, November 7, 2017;
9	C. Joint proposed pretrial order: Thursday, December 7, 2017. Pursuant
10	to LR 26-1(b)(5), if dispositive motions are filed, this deadline will be suspended
11	until 30 days after decision of the dispositive motions or further order of the Court.
12	The Moving Parties also agree and stipulate to extend the deadline for
13	rebuttal expert disclosures by 30 days:
14	D. Rebuttal expert disclosures: Wednesday, July 12, 2017.
15	
16	
17	[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

# BALLARD SPAHR LLP 100 NORTH CITY PARKWAY, SUITE 1750 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106 (702) 471-7000 FAX (702) 471-7070

### CONCLUSION

For the above-stated reasons, the Moving Parties respectfully request that this Court enter an Order granting this Joint Motion to Amend the Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order using the new deadlines noted above.

Dated this 30th day of May, 2017.

Dated this 30th day of May, 2017.

BALLARD SPAHR LLP

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DENNETT WINSPEAR, LLP

Owners Association

By: /s/ Justin A. Shiroff
Abran E. Vigil, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 7548
Justin A. Shiroff, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12869
100 North City Parkway, Suite 1750

By: \_\_/s/ Matthew A. Sarnoski Gina Gilbert Winspear, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 5552 Matthew A. Sarnoski, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 9176 3301 N. Buffalo Drive, Suite 195 Las Vegas, NV 89129

Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

Attorney for Sherman Oaks Estates

Attorneys for Plaintiff

## <u>ORDER</u>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES MAGASTRATE JUDGE

Dated: 6/01/2017