

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RENARD T. POLK,	)	3:16-CV-0652-MMD-CBC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	August 19, 2019
	)	
TARA CARPENTER, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE CARLA BALDWIN CARRY, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is plaintiff's motion to compel discovery, motion request for subpoenas, and motion for enlargement of time to amend pleadings and join additional parties (ECF Nos. 83, 84, 87). Defendants opposed the motions (ECF Nos. 86 & 90), and plaintiff replied (ECF No. 88). Also before the court is defendants' motion to extend time to file dispositive motions (ECF No. 87), which plaintiff did not oppose. The court will address each request in turn.

**ECF Nos. 83/84 – Motion to Compel Discovery and Motion Request for Subpoenas Duces Tecum**

On July 15, 2019, plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery and a motion request for subpoenas duces tecum<sup>1</sup>, arguing that defendants wrongfully withheld discovery responses. (ECF Nos. 83/84). Defendants oppose the motions, stating that plaintiff has failed to follow Local Rule 26-7(c), which requires that a party submitting a discovery motion make a good-faith effort to meet and confer with the opposing party before filing the motion. (ECF No. 86). Plaintiff's reply states that the defendants had the opportunity to meet and confer during the mediation process but failed to do so. (ECF No. 88). The court notes that the mediation conference was held on February 13, 2018. (See ECF No.

<sup>1</sup> ECF Nos. 83 and 84 are identical motions.

