

1 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Attorney General
2 BETH HICKMAN
Senior Deputy Attorney General
3 Nevada Bar No. 11598
Bureau of Litigation
4 100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717
5 Telephone: (775) 684-1251
Fax: (775) 684-1275
6 E-Mail: EHickman@ag.nv.gov

7 *Attorneys for Defendants*
Bruce Bannister, Francis Chelli, Doni K. Jennings,
8 *Grant Lee, Kara Krause LeGrand, and Cole Morrow*

9
10 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

12 DANTE PATTISON,
13 Plaintiff,
14 vs.
15 THE STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,
16 Defendants.

Case No. 3:14-cv-00020-MMD-VPC
**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME TO OPPOSE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**
(SECOND REQUEST)
AND
**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**
(FIRST REQUEST)

21 Defendants, Bruce Bannister, Francis Chelli, Doni K. Jennings, Grant Lee, Kara Krause
22 LeGrand, and Cole Morrow, by and through counsel, Adam Paul Laxalt, Nevada Attorney
23 General, and Beth Hickman, Senior Deputy Attorney General, move for an extension of time
24 of time to April 29, 2015, to oppose Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and to file
25 Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment. This motion is brought pursuant to Federal Rule
26 of Civil Procedure 6(b) and is based on the following memorandum of points and authorities
27 and all papers and pleadings on file in this case.

28 ///

1 **Memorandum of Points and Authorities**

2 Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b) provides, in relevant part, "When an act may or must be done
3 within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time: (A) with or without
4 motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its
5 extension expires" The "good cause" standard "primarily considers the diligence of the
6 party seeking the amendment." *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609
7 (9th Cir. 1992). A party demonstrates good cause for the modification of a scheduling order
8 by showing that, even with the exercise of due diligence, he or she was unable to meet the
9 timetable set forth in the order. *See Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d
10 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002).

11 Dispositive motions in this matter are due today, March 18, 2015. #62. Today is also
12 the extended deadline Defendants received to oppose Plaintiff's motion for summary
13 judgment, which was necessary to allow Defendants the opportunity to conduct discovery
14 before briefing dispositive motions. Good cause exists to extend time because, despite
15 diligence on the part of Defendants, Plaintiff's misconduct has hindered Defendants' ability to
16 complete discovery prior to the dispositive motion deadline established by the Court.

17 On December 31, 2014, Defendants moved for leave to depose Plaintiff. #72. The
18 motion was granted on January 16, 2015, and Plaintiff's deposition was to occur February 6,
19 2015. Defendants hired a stenographer and coordinated with the prison to conduct the
20 deposition of Plaintiff at Northern Nevada Correctional Center (NNCC) on February 6, 2015;
21 however, Plaintiff refused to participate. Ex. A. On February 20, 2015, the Court denied
22 Plaintiff's motion to stay his deposition, informing him he "initiated this case and defendants
23 have the right to take his deposition pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 27." #103. As such,
24 Defendants have noticed Plaintiff's deposition, currently scheduled for March 30, 2015.¹

25 Defendants' request for an extension of time is brought in good faith and is not being
26

27 ¹ Defendants previously noticed Plaintiff's deposition for March 23, 2015. However, defense counsel primarily
28 assigned to this matter is participating in a trial proceeding before the Honorable Judge Hicks in Case No. 3:11-
cv-00548-LRH-WGC, which was anticipated to conclude by March 20, 2015, but will likely continue beyond
March 23, 2015. As such, Defendants have re-noticed the deposition of Plaintiff for March 30, 2015, at 1:00 p.m.
at NNCC.

1 brought for the purpose of delay. Plaintiff's deposition testimony is something which
2 Defendants are entitled to obtain, and the testimony is necessary to properly brief dispositive
3 motions. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request an extension to April 29, 2015, to
4 oppose Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and to file Defendants' motion for summary
5 judgment.

6 Dated: March 18, 2014.

7 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
8 Attorney General

9 By Beth Hickman
10 BETH HICKMAN
11 Senior Deputy Attorney General
12 Bureau of Litigation

13 *Attorneys for Defendants*

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED**
15 Valerie O. Johnson
16 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17 DATED: March 23, 2015

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the Office of the Attorney General, State of Nevada, and that on March 18, 2015, I served a copy of **Defendants' Motion For Extension Of Time To Oppose Plaintiff's Motion For Summary Judgment (Second Request) AND Motion for Extension of time to File Defendants' Motion For Summary Judgment (First Request)** by U.S. District Court CM/ECF Electronic Filing to:

Dante H. Pattison #88986
Care of NNCC Law Librarian
Northern Nevada Correctional Center
P O Box 7000
Carson City, NV 89702
lawlibrary@doc.nv.gov

Pamela L. Stanley
