

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**

ROBERT SUSTRIK, et al., <div style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff(s),</div>	}	Case No. 2:16-cv-02866-RFB-NJK
vs.	}	ORDER
EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES, LLC,	}	(Docket No. 57)
Defendant(s).	}	

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs’ motion to extend the discovery cutoff by 90 days. Docket No. 57. Defendant filed a response in partial opposition, agreeing only to an extension of 30 days. Docket No. 60. Plaintiffs filed a reply. Docket No. 62. Had common-sense practicality and cooperation prevailed during the meet-and-confer process, this dispute would not have required judicial intervention. *Cf. Olesczuk v. Citizens One Home Loans*, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 153342, at *2-3 (D. Nev. Nov. 4, 2016).¹ Having now reviewed the motion and briefing, the Court finds good cause exists for a 60-day

¹ The parties contacted chambers in an attempt to resolve this dispute informally pursuant to Local Rule 1-1(b) before conducting their required meet-and-confer on the dispute. See Docket No. 57-1 at ¶ 22 (“Because the Court indicated its preference for briefing, the parties held their 26-7 conference”). As the Court has explained previously, an informal conference with chambers may not be used a substitute for conducting a meet-and-confer. See *Olesczuk*, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 153342, at *2 (“Local Rule 1-1 has not transformed magistrate judges into clearinghouses for resolving insignificant discovery disputes. Counsel are still expected to seek court involvement as a last resort only when a discovery dispute implicates truly significant interests that counsel cannot resolve through reasonable cooperation during the meet-and-confer process”).

1 extension of the discovery cutoff and subsequent deadlines.² The motion to extend is therefore

2 **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part, and deadlines are **SET** as follows:

- 3 • Discovery cutoff: January 8, 2018
- 4 • Dispositive motions: February 7, 2018
- 5 • Joint proposed pretrial order: March 9, 2018

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: October 20, 2017



8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 _____
28 ² In briefing the motion to extend, the parties provide argument regarding the appropriateness of certain discovery sought. The Court expresses no opinion herein on those issues.