

KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER & JOHNSON, CHTD.
8985 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 200
Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
(702) 362-6666

1 GARY E. SCHNITZER, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 395
2 ADAM J. WAX, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 12126
3 KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER, & JOHNSON, CHTD.
8985 So. Eastern Avenue, Suite 200
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
Telephone: (702) 352-6666
5 Facsimile: (702) 362-2203
6 Email: gschnitzer@ksjattorneys.com
awax@ksjattorneys.com
7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff,*
Trade Show Services, LTD.
8 *d/b/a Pro-Tect Security*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

10 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

11 TRADE SHOW SERVICES, LTD., a Nevada
12 Corporation, d/b/a PRO-TECT SECURITY
SERVICES,

Case No.: 2:17-cv-01685-JAD-NJK

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 INTEGRATED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT
SERVICES, INC., an Arizona Corporation;
16 INTEGRATED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT
SERVICES, INC., d/b/a SPECIAL
17 INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, an Arizona
18 Corporation; DOE INDIVIDUALS I through X,
inclusive; and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES I
19 through X, inclusive,

20 Defendants.

21 **STIPULATION AND ORDER TO FILE PLAINTIFF’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF**
22 **MOTION TO DISQUALIFY DEFENDANTS’ ATTORNEYS ON JANUARY 30,**
23 **2018 (SECOND REQUEST)**

24 Plaintiff, TRADE SHOW SERVICES, LTD., d/b/a PRO-TECT SECURITY SERVICES
25 (“Pro-Tect”), by and through its counsel of record, Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq., and Adam Wax,
26 Esq., of the law firm Kravitz, Schnitzer & Johnson, Chtd., and Defendant, Integrated Systems
27 Improvement Services, Inc., d/b/a Special Intelligence Services (“Defendant”), by and through
its counsel of record, Michael D. Rawlins, Esq., of the law firm Durham Jones & Pinegar, hereby

1 stipulate and agree that Plaintiff will file its Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's
2 Motion to Disqualify Defendants' Attorneys on or before January 30, 2018. Defendant's
3 Opposition was filed on December 26, 2017, making Pro-Tect's Reply due on or before January
4 2, 2018. *ECF No. 32*. The Parties previously mutually agreed by stipulation that January 16,
5 2018, would be Pro-Tect's deadline to file its Reply in support of *ECF No. 28*. *ECF No. 36*. Due
6 to the holidays, the Parties' schedules and the person(s) from Pro-Tect that counsel requires to
7 respond to the Opposition being committed to CES for the next 7-10 days¹, unforeseen
8 circumstances, and additional matters necessitating the attention of the Parties and their counsel,
9 combined with counsel's duty to provide a complete response to the Opposition, the Parties have
10 mutually agreed in good faith that Pro-Tect shall have additional time for its Reply. Thus, the
11 Parties have mutually agreed that Pro-Tect shall have until on or before **January 30, 2018**, as
12 Pro-Tect's deadline to file its Reply in support of *ECF No. 28*. The Parties agree that this
13 Stipulation is being submitted in good faith, and not for purposes of delay. Further, this
14 Stipulation is made in accordance with Local Rule 7-1 and for good cause.

15 **IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED.**


16 KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER & JOHNSON

DURHAM JONES & PINEGAR

17
18 By /s/ Adam J. Wax, Esq.
19 Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq.
20 NV Bar No.395
21 Adam J. Wax, Esq.
22 NV Bar No. 12126
23 8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 200
24 Las Vegas, NV 89123
25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

By /s/ Michael D. Rawlins, Esq.
Michael D. Rawlins
NV Bar No. 5467
10785 W. Twain Ave., Suite 200
Las Vegas, NV 89135
Attorneys for Defendant

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

27 
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
DATED: January 9, 2018

28 ¹ Plaintiff Pro-Tect is a security company and one of Pro-Tect's largest contracts is to provide security for the CES
29 show currently ongoing in Las Vegas, Nevada. As such, Pro-Tect's representative(s) are working at CES exclusively
30 for the next 7-10 days, making them unavailable to assist in the Reply.