

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**

MARIA M. CASTELAN-GUTIERREZ,)
)
 Plaintiff(s),)
)
 v.)
)
 BODEGA LATINA CORPORATION,)
)
 Defendant(s).)

Case No. 2:17-cv-01877-JAD-NJK
ORDER
(Docket No. 40)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to extend the discovery cutoff, and subsequent deadlines. Docket No. 40. Defendant filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 44. The motion is properly decided without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

The Court may modify the deadlines in the scheduling order for good cause. *See, e.g.,* Local Rule 26-4.¹ Defendant objected to certain discovery, prompting Plaintiff’s filing of a motion to compel. Docket No. 23. On February 14, 2018, the Court granted that motion to compel. Docket No. 31.

¹ This good cause standard applies even to requests that are made less than 21 days prior to the expiration of the subject deadline for which extension is sought. *See* Local Rule 26-4 (“A request made within 21 days of the subject deadline must be supported by a showing of good cause”). The Court rejects Defendant’s contention that Plaintiff’s motion should be denied as untimely, given the circumstances of this case. The Court also notes that Plaintiff initially sought relief from the Court arising out of Defendant’s failure to provide discovery as ordered on March 16, 2018. *See* Docket No. 35 (seeking to stay discovery given Defendant’s refusal to provide the discovery ordered). That motion was filed 19 days before the discovery cutoff, which is barely within the 21-day period.

1 Defendant did not provide the ordered discovery, however, because its counsel was under the mistaken
2 impression that Defendant's objection to the order compelling discovery automatically stays its
3 enforcement. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 38 at 2. On March 20, 2018, the Court disabused counsel of that
4 notion. Docket No. 36. On March 23, 2018, Defendant filed a motion to stay the enforcement of the
5 undersigned's order compelling discovery. Docket No. 38. On March 30, 2018, the Court denied that
6 motion. Docket No. 43. Defendant represents that it provided compelled documents on April 2, 2018.
7 Docket No. 44 at 3. In short, there was a substantial delay in Defendant providing discovery to which
8 Plaintiff was entitled. Such circumstances more than suffice for an extension to the discovery cutoff.²

9 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the motion to extend is **GRANTED** and deadlines are
10 **EXTENDED** as follows:

- 11 • Discovery cutoff: June 4, 2018
- 12 • Dispositive motions: July 3, 2018
- 13 • Joint proposed pretrial order: August 3, 2018, or 30 days after resolution of dispositive
14 motions

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: April 6, 2018

17 
18 _____
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 _____
28 ² This is an extension for discovery generally, and the Court declines to limit the remaining discovery
in the manner proposed by Defendant. *See* Docket No. 44 at 6-7.