

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**

DOMINICK J. CHIAPPARELLI,
Plaintiff(s),

v.

PORTFOLIO RECOVERY ASSOCIATES,
LLC, et al.,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-cv-03098-GMN-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 11)

Pending before the Court is Defendant Portfolio Recovery Associates’ motion to extend the deadline to respond to the complaint. Docket No. 11. As the motion acknowledges, however, the governing deadline expired two months ago. *Id.* at 1. To revive an expired deadline, a party must show both good cause and excusable neglect. *See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B). No such showing has been made. *Cf. Rybski v. Home Depot USA, Inc.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. Lexis 150152, at *5-6 (D. Ariz. Oct. 17, 2012) (collecting cases that settlement discussions, standing alone, are not grounds for an extension). Nor are the parties permitted to stipulate to extend a Court deadline without Court approval. Local Rule 7-1(b). Nonetheless, given that there is no opposition and as a one-time courtesy, the Court will **GRANT** the motion in this case. **NO FURTHER EXTENSIONS WILL BE GRANTED.**

Absent a request being granted saying otherwise, the scheduling order at Docket No. 8 applies to Defendant Portfolio Recovery Associates.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 12, 2018



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge