

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**

ROBERT W. OLSON,
Plaintiff(s),
v.
CONVERGENT OUTSOURCING, INC.,
Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00201-APG-NJK
Order
(Docket No. 8)

Pending before the Court is the parties’ joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order requesting special scheduling review. Docket No. 8. The parties seek an extended discovery period of 213 days measured from the date Defendant filed its answer on April 20, 2018. Id.; see also Docket No. 6.

A discovery period longer than the presumptively reasonable discovery period of 180 days “must include...a statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply....” Local Rule 26-1(a). The parties ask for an extended discovery period “to ensure the parties have sufficient time to both conduct its own investigations and engage in settlement discussions before expending significant resources to conduct discovery and prepare dispositive motions.” Docket No. 8 at 1. This statement of the reason why a longer time period should apply is vague and, therefore, insufficient under Local Rule 26-1(a) to warrant an extended discovery period that is longer than the presumptively reasonable discovery period of 180 days.

1 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties' joint proposed discovery
2 plan. Docket No. 8. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than
3 June 5, 2018.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: May 30, 2018

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge