UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** RESIDENTIAL CREDIT SOLUTIONS, INC., Plaintiff(s), 2:17-cv-00084-JCM-NJK **ORDER** vs. LV REAL ESTATE STRATEGIC INVESTMENT (Docket No. 16) GROUP LLC SERIES 5112, Defendant(s). 

Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed joint discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 16. Under Local Rule 26-1(b)(1), "[u]nless the court orders otherwise, discovery periods longer than 180 days from the date the first defendant answers or otherwise appears will require special scheduling review." Additionally, "[p]lans requesting special scheduling review must include . . . a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case." Local Rule 26-1(a).

In this instance, the parties request a 284-day discovery period because, they submit, "counsel for the parties have numerous quiet title actions involving the same or similar issues that were filed within a short time frame." Docket No. 16 at 2. As the Court has previously explained, that is not good reason to extend the discovery period. *See, e.g., Bank of Am., N.A. v. Premier One Holdings, Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 146839, at \*2 (D. Nev. Oct. 29, 2015); *Greene v. Alhambra Hosp. Med. Ctr.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 72697, at \*3 (D. Nev. June 3, 2015).

	1
	2
	3
	<i>3</i>
	-
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	

28

Accordingly, the parties' proposed joint discovery plan is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice. The Court **ORDERS** the parties to submit, no later than April 26, 2017, a proposed joint discovery plan that either (1) is based on the presumptively reasonable 180-day period outlined in Local Rule 26-1, or (2) provides an adequate explanation why a longer period should be granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 19, 2017.

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge