

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TCHUTIMA, INC.,  
Plaintiff(s),  
v.  
BUA GROUP, LLC,  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-01130-JCM-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 55]

13 Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion for leave to serve a supplemental expert  
14 report. Docket No. 55. The Court has not identified in that motion any standards for seeking leave  
15 from the Court to supplement an expert report. *See id.* at 10, 11. Moreover, the governing rule  
16 contemplates supplementation in appropriate circumstances without seeking judicial pre-approval.  
17 *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)(A)*.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Court DENIES without prejudice Plaintiffs'  
18 motion for leave to serve a supplemental expert report.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: January 7, 2025

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

27  
28

<sup>1</sup> Such supplementation would be subject (if warranted) to the opposing party's filing of a motion to exclude or other challenge. *See, e.g., Silvagni v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 320 F.R.D. 237, 240 n.1 (D. Nev. 2017).