

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**

TERRY CORYELL,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Dept. of
the Navy, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00593-GMN-NJK

Order

(Docket No. 38)

Pending before the Court is the parties’ joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order requesting special scheduling review. Docket No. 38. The joint proposed discovery plan suffers from numerous deficiencies.

First, the joint proposed discovery plan does not include the required statement that the parties have met and conferred about the possibility of using alternative dispute-resolution processes, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(7). The joint proposed discovery plan also does not include the required statement that the parties have considered consent to trial by a magistrate judge, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(8).

Second, although the parties seek an extended discovery period, they measure the discovery period from July 23, 2018, the date they filed the instant joint proposed discovery plan, as opposed to June 6, 2018, the date the first Defendant answered or appeared. *Id.* at 2; see also Docket No. 23. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1) requires that the discovery cut-off be measured from the date the first Defendant appeared, not the date the parties filed their joint proposed discovery plan.

