UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Plaintiff(s), v. ADVANCE POLYBAG (NEVADA), INC., Defendant(s).	Case No. 2:17-cv-02077-RFB-NJK ORDER (Docket No. 17)

Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend all of the deadlines in the scheduling order by 90 days. Docket No. 17. Requests to extend the deadlines set by the scheduling order must be supported by a showing of good cause. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 26-4. Good cause exists if the subject deadline "cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension." *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 409 (9th Cir. 2000). The pending stipulation identifies the "reasons" for the extension request as the mere fact that more time is desired for discovery. Docket No. 17 at 2. This is not sufficient for any extension, let alone one seeking to enlarge the discovery period by a whopping 50% only a month after the parties represented that they needed only 180 days to complete discovery. *See* Docket No. 14. Instead, the parties must provide "[t]he reasons why the deadline was not satisfied or the remaining discovery was not completed within the time limits set by the discovery plan." Local Rule 26-4. Merely identifying a desire for additional time to conduct discovery does not provide a reason why an extension is needed; instead the parties must explain why it is they are unable to meet the schedule already established by the Court.

Moreover, with respect to the deadline to amend the pleadings, that deadline expired prior to the filing of the stipulation. *See* Docket No. 15 at 2. In addition to failing to identify good cause to extend that deadline, the stipulation fails to show the excusable neglect required to resuscitate an expired deadline. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 26-4.

Accordingly, the stipulation to extend is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 29, 2017

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge