

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 MICHAEL RENO, et al.,

11 Plaintiff(s),

12 v.

13 WESTERN CAB COMPANY, et al.,

14 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00840-APG-NJK

Order

[Docket Nos. 197, 198]

15 Pending before the Court is are Plaintiffs' motion to extend deadlines and motion to stay
16 discovery. Docket Nos. 197, 198. For the reasons discussed below, both motions are **DENIED**
17 without prejudice.

18 **I. MEET AND CONFER**

19 Counsel must engage in a good faith meet and confer prior to filing a discovery motion.
20 Local Rule 26-6(c). Such a conference must take place in person, by telephone, or by video. Local
21 Rule IA 1-3(f). Written communication and voicemails are insufficient. *Id.* Plaintiffs support the
22 instant motions through a declaration that their counsel left a voicemail with defense counsel the
23 afternoon before filing the motions and that defense counsel responded by email. *See* Docket No.
24 197 at 13. Such efforts do not constitute a proper meet and confer, which is grounds for denying
25 the motions.

26 **II. MOTION TO EXTEND**

27 On May 1, 2020, the Court rejected Plaintiffs' efforts to extend the expert disclosure
28 deadline because, *inter alia*, Plaintiffs did not discuss the governing standards. Docket No. 180 at

1 1-2 n.2. The Court has also warned several times in this case that motions must be supported by
2 recitation of the governing standards and meaningful discussion. *See, e.g., id.* at 1.

3 Plaintiffs' pending motion to extend contains no identification of the governing standards
4 nor meaningful discussion as to how they are met. Docket No. 197. This is troubling given the
5 prior admonitions in this case. Moreover, this shortcoming is particularly significant here given
6 that the motion in actuality seeks not only to extend certain deadlines, but also to revive expired
7 deadlines. *See, e.g., id.* at 6. As such, the motion is subject both to the "good cause" standard and
8 the "excusable neglect" standard with respect to the expired deadlines. Local Rule 26-3.¹ Neither
9 standard is identified or discussed in meaningful fashion, which is ground for denying the motion.

10 **III. MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY**

11 As noted above, the Court has cautioned in this case on several occasions that motions
12 must be supported by legal standards and well-developed argument. Plaintiffs' motion to stay
13 discovery consists of a single paragraph bereft of any citation to legal authority, any recitation of
14 the governing standards, and any meaningful discussion. Docket No. 198 at 7-8. Such
15 shortcomings are grounds for denying the motion.

16 **IV. CONCLUSION**

17 For the reasons discussed above, the motion to extend/reopen deadlines and the motion to
18 stay discovery are both **DENIED** without prejudice. In light of the multiple admonitions with
19 respect to proper motion practice, Plaintiffs' counsel is also **WARNED** that future filing of
20 motions that lack discussion of the applicable standards, citation to legal authority, and/or
21 meaningful discussion may subject him to sanctions. *See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.*

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: August 3, 2020

24
25 
26 _____
27 Nancy J. Koppe
28 United States Magistrate Judge

27 _____
28 ¹ This has already been explained to Plaintiffs' counsel elsewhere in this case. Docket No. 183 at 1.