UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TERRY CORYELL,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, et al.,

Defendant(s).

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

ORDER

(Docket No. 40)

Pending before the Court is the parties' renewed joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order requesting special scheduling review. Docket No. 40. The renewed joint proposed discovery plan suffers from numerous deficiencies.

First, Local Rule IA 6-2 dictates the placement of the signature block intended for the court in granting a motion or stipulation. The parties fail to abide by this rule. *Id.* at 5. Second, some of the deadlines are miscalculated. *Id.* at 3. Third, the parties submit that they are requesting an extended discovery period because, in part, "there are pending motions to dismiss." *Id.* at 2. The pendency of a dispositive motion is not a sufficient reason under Local Rule 26-1(a) to warrant an extended discovery period that is longer than the presumptively reasonable discovery period of 180 days.

//

//

//

Moreover, once the scheduling order has been issued, the parties must diligently conduct discovery unless a stay is granted, and a stay has not been granted in the instant case

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 30, 2018

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge