28

Case 2:17-cv-00090-JAD-DJA Document 82 Filed 05/29/20 Page 2 of 4

The next discovery deadline affected by this stipulation is the June 2, 2020 rebuttal expert deadline. With the exception of the rebuttal expert deadline, this stipulation will be received by the Court "no later than 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline," as is required by LR 26-3. With respect to the rebuttal expert deadline, the parties set forth a statement of excusable neglect below

Pursuant to LR IA 6-1 and LR 26-3, and good cause appearing therefor, the parties hereby make the following required statements:

I. Discovery Completed.

In June and July 2018, Plaintiff served written discovery on Defendants to which Defendants timely responded.

Since pro bono counsel was appointed, Plaintiff served three subpoenas duces tecum on non-parties to the case. Plaintiff recently received documents and is preparing them for disclosure.

On May 4, 2020, Plaintiff timely served Defendants with his expert disclosures.

II. Discovery that remains to be completed.

Plaintiff intends on conducting a deposition and issuing written discovery. Defendants intend on disclosing a rebuttal expert with disclosures. Defendants intend on determining the need for depositions and will respond to Plaintiff's written discovery.

III. The reasons why the discovery will not be completed within the time set by the Scheduling Order

Discovery in this matter closed on August 24, 2018. ECF No. 37. On September 25, 2019, the Court granted Plaintiff's request for appointment of pro bono counsel. ECF No. 67. The Parties stipulated to reopen discovery for 120 days, and this Court issued an order reopening discovery on November 8, 2019. ECF No. 71. Subpoenas were served and the time needed for responses prevented Plaintiff from having sufficient time to complete and submit expert disclosures. Therefore, this Court granted the current extension setting the due date for expert disclosures on May 4, 2020. ECF No. 78. Rebuttal experts are currently

Case 2:17-cv-00090-JAD-DJA Document 82 Filed 05/29/20 Page 3 of 4

due on June 2, 2020. *Id.* Defendants secured a rebuttal expert, but the time remaining to submit rebuttal expert disclosures is insufficient.

IV. Statement of Excusable Neglect Pursuant to LR 26-3: Requests to extend a discovery deadline filed less than 21 days before the expiration of that particular deadline must be supported by a showing of excusable neglect. *Derosa v. Blood Sys., Inc.*, 2:13-cv-0137-JCM-NJK, 2013 WL 3975764, *1 (D. Nev. Aug. 1, 2013). The determination of whether excusable neglect exists turns on four factors: (1) the danger of prejudice to the opposing party; (2) the length of the delay and its potential impact on the proceedings; (3) the reason for the delay; and (4) whether the movant acted in good faith." *Bateman v. U.S. Postal Service*, 231 F.3d 1220, 1223-24 (9th Cir. 2000) (citing *Pioneer Investment Services Co. v. Brunswick Assoc. Ltd. Partnership*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993)). Excusable neglect also encompasses negligence, carelessness, and inadvertent mistake. *Id.* at 1224.

Here, all four of the *Bateman* considerations weigh in favor of a finding of excusable neglect in connection with the parties' request to extend the rebuttal expert deadline: (i) neither party will be prejudiced as both have stipulated to the requested extension; (ii) the length of the delay is negligible and the stipulation will be filed 14 days before the current deadline; (iii) the reason for the delay is that Defendants need additional time to finalize their rebuttal expert report because of the logistical difficulties of retaining a rebuttal expert, and preparing and disclosing a rebuttal expert report in 30 days given the current COVID-19 closures; and (iv) contrary to the circumstances in *Derosa*, the parties are actively conducting discovery. Accordingly, the parties respectfully request that the Court finds excusable neglect exists with respect to the rebuttal expert deadline. With respect to the other discovery deadlines, the parties submit this stipulation more than 21 days prior to the expiration of those deadlines.

27 ||///

28 ||///

1

2

3

56

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

2728

V. Proposed Scheduling Order

Therefore, Defendants request and Plaintiff stipulates to the following deadlines:1

EVENT	CURRENT DEADLINE (ECF No. 78)	PROPOSED DEADLINE
Rebuttal Expert Disclosures	June 2, 2020	July 3, 2020
Close of Discovery	July 6, 2020	September 4, 2020
Dispositive Motions	August 3, 2020	October 5, 2020
Pretrial Order ²	September 1, 2020	November 4, 2020

DATED this 19th day of May, 2020.

McDONALD CARANO LLP

Kristen T. Gallagher (NSBN 9561)

Jason Sifers (NSBN 14273) 2300 W. Sahara Ave, Suite 1200

Las Vegas, NV 89102

kgallagher@mcdonaldcarano.com

jsifers@mcdonaldcarano.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

OFFICE OF THE NEVADA ATTORNEY

GENERAL

AARON D. FORD (NSBN 7704) Austin T. Barnum (NSBN 15174)

555 East Washington Ave., Suite 3900

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Email: abarnum@ag.nv.gov

Attorneys for Defendants Romeo Aranas, Gregory Bryan, Alberto Buencamino, and

George Leaks

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: May 20, 2020

¹ Parties are not seeking an extension the following at this time, and are left out of the above dates as a result: (1) the deadline to amend the pleadings or add parties, (2) Expert disclosures

² If dispositive motions are filed, then the pre-trial order shall be due 30 days after the ruling on the motions.