	TATES DISTRICT COURT TRICT OF NEVADA
KALVAN K. KALDOR,	) 3:10-cv-0529-LRH (RAM)
Plaintiff,	) ) <u>ORDER</u>
vs.	)
HOWARD SKOLNIK, an individual,	)
HOWARD SKOLNIK, an individual, DON HELLING, an individual, STATE OF NEVADA, ex rel., its DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,	)
a political subdivision of the State of	
Nevada,	
Defendants.	
Defendants have filed an Objec	tion to Jury Demand (Doc. #13). Plaintiff has responded
to Defendants' Objection (Doc. #14) a	and Defendants have replied (Doc. #15).
Plaintiff filed his Complaint in	n the First Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada
in and for Carson City without accom	panying the Complaint with a jury demand.
On August 25, 2010, Defendar	nts removed the case to the federal district court and on
September 1, 2010, Defendants answe	ered the Complaint. Defendants did not demand a jury.
On September 22, 2010, Plain	tiff filed a Jury Demand (Doc. #9).
In the state court in Nevada a	party need not file a jury demand until the entry of the
order first setting the case for trial. N	IRCP 38. This scenario is not covered by Fed. R. Civ. P.
81(c). It is, however, similar to New	York where jury demands may be made shortly before
trial. It has been held that in that sce	enario, the court will have discretion to allow a late jury
demand. See Rule 38(b); Felix-Herno	andez v. American Airlines, Inc., 539 F.Supp.2d 511, 512

1	(D.P.R. 2007); <i>Ajnoha v. JC Penney Life Ins. Co.</i> , 480 F.Supp.2d 663, 676-77 (E.D.N.Y. 2007);
2	Dreedlove v. Cabou, 296 F.Supp.2d 253, 278 (N.D.N.Y. 2003).
3	Under the circumstances of this case, the court exercises its discretion and allows the
4	jury demand filed by the Plaintiff.
5	Defendants' Objection to Jury Demand (Doc. #13) is <b>DENIED</b> .
6	DATED: November 16, 2010.
7	1 SUGIME Dise
8	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
20 21	
21 22	
22	
23	
25	
26	
27	
28	