

1 Joel D. Odou (State Bar No. 7468)
 2 jodou@wshblaw.com
 3 Christina M. Mamer (State Bar No. 13181)
 4 cmamer@wshblaw.com
 5 Susana Santana (State Bar No. 13753)
 6 ssantana@wshblaw.com
 7 **WOOD, SMITH, HENNING & BERMAN LLP**
 8 2881 Business Park Court, Suite 200
 9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89128-9020
 10 Phone: 702 251 4100 ♦ Fax: 702 251 5405
 11 Attorneys for Aramark Services, Inc.

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 13 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

14 TOLAVIUS TIMMONS,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
 18 DEPARTMENT; CAPTAIN ANDREW
 19 PERALTA; ARAMARK; BONNIE POLLEY;
 20 LT. YANCEY TAYLOR; SGT. FRANC
 21 CADET; LEONEL VERDUZCO; SHERIFF
 22 JOE LOMBARDO,

23 Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00361-JAD-NJK

**ARAMARK SERVICES INC.'S MOTION
 FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
 RESPONSIVE PLEADING**

[FIRST REQUEST]

24 Defendant Aramark Services, Inc., by and through its counsel, Wood, Smith, Henning &
 25 Berman, LLP, hereby moves this Court for a thirty (30) day extension of time to answer or otherwise
 26 respond to Plaintiff, Tolavius Simmons' Second Amended Complaint [ECF 8], filed on October 11,
 27 2018, in the above-entitled action.

28 This motion is made and based upon the pleadings and papers on file, and the memorandum of
 points and authorities herein.

///
///
///

WOOD, SMITH, HENNING & BERMAN LLP
 Attorneys at Law
 2881 BUSINESS PARK COURT, SUITE 200
 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89128-9020
 TELEPHONE 702.251.4100 ♦ FAX 702.251.5405

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

3 On October 11, 2018, Plaintiff filed his Second Amended Complaint [ECF 8]. Thereafter, on
4 January 29, 2019, the Court entered an Order [ECF 11] allowing certain causes of action in Plaintiff's
5 Second Amended Complaint to proceed. A Summons [ECF 12] was issued to Aramark on January
6 30, 2019, and Aramark was then served with Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint on April 4, 2019.
7 As such, an Answer or other response to the Complaint is due on or before April 24, 2019. Upon
8 receipt of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Aramark began the process of reviewing Plaintiff's
9 Complaint and obtaining the pertinent records, which are necessary to effectively respond to Plaintiff's
10 Complaint and defend the instant action.¹ Despite Aramark's diligent efforts, further time is needed to
11 respond to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint.

12 **II. LEGAL ANALYSIS**

13 FED. R. CIV. P. 6(b) provides:

- 14 1) *In General.* When an act may or must be done within a specified time,
15 the court may, for good cause, extend the time:
16 (A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is
17 made, before the original time or its extension expires; or
18 (B) on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act
19 because of excusable neglect.
20 (2) *Exceptions.* A court must not extend the time to act under Rules 50(b)
21 and (d), 52(b), 59(b), (d) and (e), and 60(b).

19 LR IA 6-1 provides in pertinent part:

- 20 (a) A motion or stipulation to extend time must state the reasons for the
21 extension requested and must inform the court of all previous extensions of
22 the subject deadline the court granted. . . . A request made after the
23 expiration of the specified period will not be granted unless the movant or
24 attorney demonstrates that the failure to file the motion before the deadline
25 expired was the result of excusable neglect. Immediately below the title of
26 the motion or stipulation there also must be a statement indicating whether
27 it is the first, second, third, etc., requested extension. . . .
28 (b) The court may set aside any extension obtained in contravention of this
rule.

25 Rule 6(b)(1) allows for a party to move for an enlargement of time, the determination of which
26 lies with the presiding court. "The Court has inherent power and discretion to control its docket, and
27

28 ¹ See Declaration of Christina M. Mamer, Esq., attached hereto as **Exhibit "A."**

1 the proceedings within the cases on its docket." *Ford v. County of Missoula, Mont.*, 2010 WL
2 2674036, 1 (D. Mont., 2010) (citing *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936); *see also*
3 Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b) (advisory committee note, 1946) ("Rule 6(b) is a rule of general application giving
4 wide discretion to the court to enlarge these limits or revive them after they have expired . . .").

5 Defendant is requesting an extension of time to file its answer or other response to Plaintiff's
6 Second Amended Complaint [ECF 8] before the deadline has expired. Defendant is making this
7 request based upon good cause to gather key pieces of information that are necessary to effectively
8 defend the instant action and properly respond to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint. Since
9 receiving Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, Aramark has begun the process of requesting
10 information from individual(s) that may have personal knowledge of the events described in Plaintiff's
11 Second Amended Complaint, however, further time is needed to gather the requested information. As
12 such, Aramark respectfully requests a thirty (30) day enlargement of time in which to file an Answer
13 or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, up to and including May 24, 2019.

14 ///
15 ///
16 ///
17 ///
18 ///
19 ///
20 ///
21 ///
22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///
26 ///
27 ///
28 ///

