

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LAUSTEVEION JOHNSON,

Plaintiff

v.

GENTRY, et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:17-cv-01671-APG-EJY

**Order Rejecting Proposed Joint Pretrial
Orders**

[ECF Nos. 82, 86, 93, 105]

Plaintiff Lausteveion Johnson has filed three proposed pretrial orders. ECF Nos. 82, 86, 105. The defendants filed one proposed pretrial order. ECF No. 93. None of these proposed orders satisfies Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4. First, the parties have not personally discussed settlement and or the preparation of the proposed order as required by Local Rule 16-3(b). *See* ECF No. 93 at n.1.

In their respective exhibit lists, each party lists “[a]ny and all other exhibits that may support the statements of fact and law cited herein and to rebut [the other party’s] statements, claims, and testimony.” *See* ECF No. 93 at 5. The parties list similar other vague descriptions and barely list any actual exhibits they intend to use. Local Rule 16-3(b)(8) requires parties to list their trial exhibits, and “describe the exhibits sufficiently for ready identification” The parties’ failure to list their specific exhibits makes it impossible for the other parties to object to each other’s exhibits, as required by Local Rule 16-3(b)(8)(B).

In their list of witnesses, the defendants list “[a]ny and all other witnesses that have personal knowledge supporting Defendant’s statement of fact or law cited herein.” ECF No. 93 at 8. This attempt to reserve the right to call literally anyone at trial violates Local Rule 16-3(b)(12).

1 Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4 are designed to streamline trial preparation and presentation,
2 and to foster settlement. The parties cannot simply wait to make trial decisions until the eve of
3 trial. Nor may the parties simply list every document that has been produced in the case. Such
4 tactics prevent full participation in settlement discussions and deprive the other side the ability to
5 efficiently prepare for trial. It is apparent from the proposed Joint Pretrial Order that the parties
6 ignored Local Rule 16-3.

7 I THEREFORE ORDER that the parties' Joint Pretrial Orders (**ECF Nos. 82, 86, 93,**
8 **105) are REJECTED.** The parties shall confer as required in Local Rule 16-3 and submit a
9 Joint Pretrial Order that complies with Local Rules 16-3 and 16-4 **by September 2, 2021.**

10 DATED this 22nd day of July, 2021.

11 

12 _____
13 ANDREW P. GORDON
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23