1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 10 BRENDA C. EDWARDS, 11 Case No. 2:18-cv-01072-JCM-NJK Plaintiff, 12 ORDER v. 13 (Docket No. 10) STEPHEN A. LATTIMER, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order. 16 17 Docket No. 10. The joint proposed discovery plan is defective for several reasons. First, the parties 18 erroneously filed it as a joint status report. Second, it does not include the required statement that 19 the parties have met and conferred about the possibility of using alternative dispute-resolution 20 processes, pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(7). The joint proposed discovery plan also does not 21 include the required statement that the parties have considered consent to trial by a magistrate judge, 22 pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(b)(8). Third, many of the deadlines are miscalculated. 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 // 28

Edwards v. Lattimer et al

Doc. 11

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties' joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 10. A renewed joint proposed discovery plan and scheduling order shall be filed no later than July 18, 2018.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 13, 2018

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge