

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**

LAKIHA TYSON,)	Case No. 2:18-cv-00028-GMN-NJK
Plaintiff(s),)	
v.)	ORDER
DOUGLAS FIFE, M.D., et al.,)	(Docket No. 7)
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is Defendants Cynosure’s and Hologic’s motion to extend the deadline to respond to the complaint by 14 days and for reconsideration of the previous order denying a stipulation for that relief. Docket No. 7. The pending motion indicates that an extension is requested because counsel requires additional time to assess the facts and law in order to prepare an appropriate response to the complaint. Docket No. 7 at 3. Such a reason is sufficient for the 14-day extension requested.¹

¹ The Court declines to reconsider its prior order denying the stipulation to extend. That stipulation indicated only that the parties had agreed to an extension. Such is the case with respect to every stipulation. The Local Rules require Court approval of such stipulations, *see* Local Rule 7-1(b), and the parties must present the Court with “the reasons for the extension requested” to enable that review, Local Rule IA 6-1(a). While the bar is pretty low for this type of request, were the Court to accept the parties’ agreement alone as sufficient reason, that would render Court review perfunctory. Hence, the parties must state the underlying reason for the requested extension, not just that they have agreed on it.

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

Accordingly, the motion to extend the deadline to respond by 14 days is hereby **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 17, 2018



NANCY J. KOPFE
United States Magistrate Judge