

PETERSON BAKER, PLLC
 10001 Park Run Drive
 Las Vegas, NV 89145
 702.786.1001

1 TAMARA BEATTY PETERSON, ESQ., Bar No. 5218
 tpeterson@petersonbaker.com
 2 NIKKI L. BAKER, ESQ., Bar No. 6562
 nbaker@petersonbaker.com
 3 PETERSON BAKER, PLLC
 10001 Park Run Drive
 Las Vegas, NV 89145
 4 Telephone: 702.786.1001
 Facsimile: 702.786.1002
 5

6 L. LIN WOOD, ESQ. (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
 lwood@linwoodlaw.com
 7 NICOLE JENNINGS WADE, ESQ. (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
 nwade@linwoodlaw.com
 8 G. TAYLOR WILSON, ESQ. (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
 twilson@linwoodlaw.com
 9 L. LIN WOOD, P.C.
 1180 West Peachtree Street, Suite 2400
 Atlanta, Georgia 30309
 10 Telephone: 404.891.1402
 Facsimile: 404.506.9111
 11

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Steve Wynn*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 STEVE WYNN, an individual,
 16
 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 LISA BLOOM, an individual; and THE
 BLOOM FIRM, a California Professional
 Corporation,
 19
 Defendants.
 20

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00609-JCM-GWF

**STIPULATION AND
 ORDER RE: EXTENSION OF TIME FOR
 PLAINTIFF TO FILE RESPONSE TO
 DEFENDANTS' SPECIAL MOTION TO
 DISMISS**

(First Request)

21
 22 Plaintiff Steve Wynn ("**Mr. Wynn**"), by and through his attorneys of record, Tamara Beatty
 23 Peterson, Esq. and Nikki L. Baker, Esq., of Peterson Baker, PLLC, and L. Lin Wood, Esq., Nicole
 24 Jennings Wade, Esq., and G. Taylor Wilson, Esq., of L. Lin Wood, P.C., and Defendants Lisa
 25 Bloom and The Bloom Firm (collectively, the "**Bloom Defendants**"), by and through their
 26 attorneys of record, Marc J. Randazza, Esq., Ronald D. Green, Esq., and Alex J. Shepard, Esq., of
 27 the Randazza Legal Group, PLLC, hereby agree and stipulate, subject to the Court's approval, as
 28

1 follows:

2 1. On April 5, 2018, Mr. Wynn filed his "Complaint for Defamation" [ECF No. 1]
3 against the Bloom Defendants based on a press release they issued accusing Mr. Wynn of improper
4 acts relating to a former dancer in the Wynn Las Vegas show, "ShowStoppers."

5 2. On May 8, 2018, the Bloom Defendants filed their "Answer and Affirmative
6 Defenses" [ECF No. 16].

7 3. On May 15, 2018, the Bloom Defendants filed a "Special Motion to Dismiss
8 Pursuant to NRS 41.660" [ECF No. 18] and a "Request for Judicial Notice in Support of
9 Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Invoking the Substantive Portions of the Nevada Anti-
10 SLAPP Statute, NRS 41.635 et seq." [ECF No. 19] (collectively, the "**anti-SLAPP Motion**").

11 4. In support of the anti-SLAPP Motion, the Bloom Defendants submitted twenty-five
12 (25) exhibits. (*See* ECF No. 18-2—18-27.) Six (6) of their exhibits are declarations, four (4) of
13 which are from third party witnesses testifying to facts purportedly bearing on the truth of the
14 statements at issue in this action and the knowledge of the Bloom Defendants regarding same.

15 5. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-2(b), the Clerk's Office's docket states that Mr. Wynn's
16 response to the anti-SLAPP Motion is due on May 29, 2018.

17 6. Mr. Wynn and the Bloom Defendants (collectively referred to, where appropriate,
18 as the "**Parties**") have not yet held a Rule 26(f) conference. Mr. Wynn's response to the anti-
19 SLAPP Motion is due prior to the deadline to hold any Rule 26(f) conference.

20 7. Following receipt of the anti-SLAPP Motion, Mr. Wynn's counsel informed the
21 Bloom Defendants' counsel that Mr. Wynn intended to file a Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d) motion to conduct
22 limited and necessary discovery, in the possession of the Bloom Defendants and third parties,
23 relevant to responding to the allegations in the anti-SLAPP Motion relating to falsity and actual
24 malice and, to this end, sought an extension of the deadline to file Mr. Wynn's response to the anti-
25 SLAPP Motion.

26 8. The Parties are currently attempting to agree on the discovery Mr. Wynn may
27 conduct relating to the anti-SLAPP Motion consistent with Rule 56(d). If the Parties are unable to
28

1 reach an agreement on all discovery sought by Mr. Wynn, Mr. Wynn will file a Rule 56(d) motion
2 with the Court on the disputed discovery.

3 9. To provide sufficient time for the Parties to brief and the Court to issue a decision
4 on any Rule 56(d) motion, the deadline for Mr. Wynn to file his response to the anti-SLAPP Motion
5 is extended as follows: (a) if the Court grants all or part of the Rule 56(d) motion, on the date set
6 by the Court's order; or (b) if the Court denies the Rule 56(d) motion in its entirety, within fourteen
7 (14) days after entry of the Court's order.

8 10. If, however, the Parties are able to agree upon the limited discovery Mr. Wynn may
9 conduct, the Parties will submit a stipulation and proposed order to the Court for approval, which,
10 among other things, sets forth the stipulated discovery, sets a deadline to complete this discovery,
11 and establishes a reasonable briefing scheduling for Mr. Wynn's response to the anti-SLAPP
12 Motion and the Bloom Defendants' reply in support of the anti-SLAPP Motion.

13 11. In order to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination" (*see* Fed. R.
14 Civ. P. 1) of the anti-SLAPP Motion and consistent with NRS 41.660(3)(e), a partial stay of
15 discovery is appropriate. In this regard, the Parties' obligation to hold a Rule 26(f) conference,
16 submit a stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(a), and
17 commence discovery is stayed pending a decision by the Court on the anti-SLAPP Motion, except
18 for limited discovery stipulated to by the Parties and/or permitted by the Court in response to any
19 Rule 56(d) motion filed by Mr. Wynn.

20 12. Pending the filing of and decision on any Rule 56(d) motion, the Bloom Defendants
21 will permit Mr. Wynn to engage in certain agreed upon discovery concerning the facts raised by
22 the anti-SLAPP Motion.

23 13. In light of the foregoing, the Parties submit that good cause exists for the Court to
24 approve this Stipulation, and respectfully request that, as set forth herein, the Court extend the time

25 //

26 //

27 //

28

1 for Mr. Wynn to file his response to the anti-SLAPP Motion.

2 Respectfully submitted this 29th day of May, 2018.

3
4 PETERSON BAKER, PLLC

RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC

5 By: /s/ Nikki L. Baker
6 TAMARA BEATTY PETERSON ESQ.
7 Nevada Bar No. 5218
8 tpeterson@petersonbaker.com
9 NIKKI L. BAKER, ESQ., Bar No. 6562
10 nbaker@petersonbaker.com
11 PETERSON BAKER, PLLC
12 10001 Park Run Drive
13 Las Vegas, NV 89145
14 Telephone: 702.786.1001
15 Facsimile: 702.786.1002

By: /s/ Alex J. Shepard
MARC J. RANDAZZA, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 12265
RONALD D. GREEN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 7360
ALEX J. SHEPARD, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 13582
2764 Lake Sahara Drive, Suite 109
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
Telephone: 702.420.2001
Facsimile: 305.437.7662
ecf@randazza.com

L. LIN WOOD, ESQ.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
lwood@linwoodlaw.com
NICOLE JENNINGS WADE, ESQ.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
nwade@linwoodlaw.com
G. TAYLOR WILSON, ESQ.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
twilson@linwoodlaw.com
L. LIN WOOD, P.C.
1180 West Peachtree Street, Suite 2400
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: 404.891.1402
Facsimile: 404.506.9111

*Attorneys for Defendants Lisa Bloom
and The Bloom Firm*

Attorneys for Plaintiff Steve Wynn

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 
22 _____
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

24 DATED: June 1, 2018
25 _____
26
27
28