

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**

BRIAN J. HUDSON,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
AD ASTRA RECOVERY SERVICES, INC.,  
*et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00161-JAD-GWF

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the parties’ Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No. 25), filed on March 27, 2017.

Discovery plans requesting longer than 180 days from the date the first defendant answers or appears require special scheduling review. LR 26-1(a) is explicit:


If longer deadlines are proposed, the plan must state on its face “SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED.” Plans requesting special scheduling review must include, in addition to the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(b), a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply to the case ...

The parties discovery plan requests a 240-day discovery period but does not request special scheduling review or give an adequate explanation for the longer period as required by LR 26-1(a).

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the parties’ Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No. 25) is **denied** without prejudice.

DATED this 28th day of March, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
GEORGE FOLEY, JR.  
United States Magistrate Judge