

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**

\* \* \*

First 100, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

Cenlar, FSB, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-01438-JCM-DJA

**Order**

This is a quiet title action arising out of real property located in Las Vegas, Nevada. The Honorable District Judge James C. Mahan ordered the parties to file a joint status report. (ECF No. 148). In their status report, the parties explained that discovery dates had expired and asked the Court to set a scheduling conference or enter a scheduling order to set deadlines applicable to the appearing parties. (ECF No. 153).<sup>1</sup> Because the joint status report did not explain the status of discovery or respective needs of the parties, the undersigned ordered the parties to instead stipulate to a proposed scheduling order. (ECF No. 154). The parties then filed another joint status report, explaining that they would not need to reopen discovery. (ECF No. 155). Instead, the parties requested a trial date and asked, “that the Court set a Pretrial Conference on a date convenient to the Court in advance of the selected trial date.” (*Id.*).

Because the parties are requesting to move forward with trial, they will need to submit a joint pretrial order. *See* LR 16-4; *see* LR 26-1(b)(5). The Court thus orders the parties to submit their joint pretrial order by Wednesday, April 6, 2022. However, the Court denies the parties request for a pretrial conference without prejudice. The parties have not outlined what topics they wish to address at the conference or whether briefing will be necessary. The Court does not

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties first joint status report is filed as ECF No. 151. The parties filed their amended status report one day later at ECF No. 153.

1 typically conduct pretrial conferences without a written request, and this information is vital to  
2 the undersigned's ability to schedule and conduct this conference.<sup>2</sup> See LR 16-2. The parties  
3 may move or stipulate to a pretrial conference if, after they file their joint pretrial order,  
4 outstanding issues remain which they would like to address with the undersigned at a pretrial  
5 conference.

6  
7 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the parties' joint pretrial order is due on or before  
8 **Wednesday, April 6, 2022.**

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties' request for a pretrial conference is **denied**  
10 **without prejudice.**

11  
12 DATED: March 7, 2022



---

13 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS  
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>2</sup> It is unclear from the parties' request whether they are seeking to schedule a calendar call or  
pretrial conference. To the extent the parties are seeking to schedule a calendar call, that request  
should be included in their pretrial order. See LR 16-4.