

1 ADAM PAUL LAXALT  
 Attorney General  
 2 GERRI LYNN HARDCASTLE, Bar No. 13142  
 Deputy Attorney General  
 3 State of Nevada  
 Bureau of Litigation  
 4 Public Safety Division  
 100 N. Carson Street  
 5 Carson City, NV 89701-4717  
 Tel: 775-684-1134  
 6 Email: ghardcastle@ag.nv.gov

7 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
*Romeo Aranas, Karen Gedney,*  
 8 *and Dana Marks*

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

11 RICHARD L. GRUBER,  
 12 Plaintiff,  
 13 v.  
 14 KAREN GEDNEY, et al.,  
 15 Defendants.

Case No. 3:15-cv-00543-RCJ-VPC

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
 ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO REPLY TO  
 PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION (ECF NO. 91)  
 TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
 (Second Request)**

16 Defendants, Romeo Aranas, Karen Gedney and Dana Marks, by and through counsel, Adam Paul  
 17 Laxalt, Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and Gerri Lynn Hardcastle, Deputy Attorney General,  
 18 hereby move this honorable Court for an enlargement of time to reply to Plaintiff's opposition to  
 19 Defendants' motion for summary judgment. This motion is made and based on Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1),  
 20 the following memorandum of points and authorities, and all pleadings and papers on file herein.

21 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

22 **I. RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

23 This case is a *pro se* inmate civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF No. 34.  
 24 Plaintiff, Richard Gruber (Plaintiff), alleges that Romeo Aranas, Karen Gedney, and Dana Marks  
 25 (collectively, Defendants) were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical need of Parkinson's disease  
 26 by refusing to treat Plaintiff. *Id.* at 3.

27 On March 13, 2018, this Court extended Plaintiff's time to respond to Defendants' summary  
 28 judgment motion. ECF No. 91. Plaintiff timely filed his opposition to Defendants' motion, *see* ECF No.

1 91, and Defendants' reply brief was due April 3, 2018. Due to personal obligations, Defendants' counsel  
2 was unable to complete her clients' reply by April 3rd and moved for an enlargement of time to file the  
3 reply. ECF No. 94. This honorable Court graciously granted Defendants' motion and allowed Defendants  
4 up to and including April 10, 2018 to file their reply. ECF No. 95. Although Defendants and their counsel  
5 intended to comply with today's deadline, counsel has encountered an office emergency that prevents her  
6 from finishing and filing the reply brief today. Accordingly, counsel respectfully requests two additional  
7 days to file Defendants' reply brief.

## 8 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

9 District courts have inherent power to control their dockets. *Hamilton Copper & Steel Corp. v.*  
10 *Primary Steel, Inc.*, 898 F.2d 1428, 1429 (9th Cir. 1990); *Oliva v. Sullivan*, 958 F.2d 272, 273 (9th Cir.  
11 1992). Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1) governs enlargements of time and provides as follows:

12 When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may,  
13 for good cause, extend the time: (A) with or without motion or notice if  
14 the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its  
extension expires; or (B) on motion made after the time has expired if the  
party failed to act because of excusable neglect.

15 "The proper procedure, when additional time for any purpose is needed, is to present to the  
16 Court a timely request for an extension before the time fixed has expired (*i.e.*, a request presented  
17 before the time then fixed for the purpose in question has expired)." *Canup v. Miss. Valley Barge Line*  
18 *Co.*, 31 F.R.D. 282, 283 (D.Pa. 1962). The *Canup* Court explained that "the practicalities of life" (such  
19 as an attorney's "conflicting professional engagements" or personal commitments such as vacations,  
20 family activities, illnesses, or death) often necessitate an enlargement of time to comply with a court  
21 deadline. *Id.* Extensions of time "usually are granted upon a showing of good cause, if timely made."  
22 *Creedon v. Taubman*, 8 F.R.D. 268, 269 (D.Ohio 1947). The good cause standard considers a party's  
23 diligence in seeking the continuance or extension. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*,  
24 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992).

## 25 **III. DISCUSSION**

26 Here, Defendants request two additional days to file their reply brief, or up to and including  
27 Thursday, April 12, 2018. Defendants and their counsel sincerely intended to comply with today's  
28 deadline. However, an office emergency unfortunately prevents counsel from finishing and filing the


1 reply brief in accordance with today's deadline. Consequently, Defendants respectfully request that they  
2 be allowed to file their reply brief no later than Thursday, April 12, 2018. Defendants have demonstrated  
3 good cause for the enlargement of time, and they do not believe that Plaintiff will be unfairly prejudiced by  
4 this short extension.

5 **IV. CONCLUSION**


6 Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully request that this honorable Court grant the instant  
7 motion and allow them until Thursday, April 12, 2018, to file their reply brief.

8 DATED this 10th day of April, 2018.

9 ADAM PAUL LAXALT  
10 Attorney General

11 By:   
12 GERRI LYNN HARDCASTLE  
13 Deputy Attorney General  
14 State of Nevada  
15 Bureau of Litigation  
16 Public Safety Division

*Attorneys for Defendants*

17  
18  
19 **IT IS SO ORDERED**  
  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE  
22 DATED: April 16, 2018  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28