BOKF, NA, Plaintiff, v. ROBERT ESTES, KAREN NILES, JERRY CARPENTER, SHIRLEY CARVEY, and JAMES CARPENTER and BECKY LYNN CARPENTER as Co-Trustees of the CARPENTER FAMILY REV TRUST UAD 1/19/14, Defendants.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

Case No. 3:17-cv-0694-LRH-(WGC)

ORDER

Before the court are plaintiff BOKF, NA's ("BOKF") motion for a temporary restraining order (ECF No. 43) and motion to shorten time (ECF No. 44).

In BOKF's motion for a temporary restraining order, BOKF identifies an upcoming discovery deadline in the underlying Financial Industry Regulatory Authority ("FINRA") arbitration set for March 12, 2018, and contends that a temporary restraining order staying its obligation to comply with that discovery deadline is necessary to prevent any unnecessary expense while the court addresses BOKF's now fully briefed and pending motion for preliminary injunction (ECF No. 17). *See* ECF No. 43. Along with its motion, BOKF has requested an expedited briefing schedule that would complete all briefing on the present motion for a temporary restraining order no later than Friday, March 2, 2018. *See* ECF No. 44. BOKF

contends that such an expedited schedule is necessary to allow the court to address the merits of BOKF's present motion prior to the upcoming discovery deadline. *See* ECF No. 44.

The court has reviewed BOKF's motions and shall deny the motions as moot. The court is acutely cognizant of the pending motion for a preliminary injunction along with the upcoming discovery deadline in the FINRA arbitration. In this regard, the court is currently handling the pending motions in this action and expects an order addressing the merits of BOKF's motion for a preliminary injunction within two (2) weeks. As this would effectively be the same time period requested in the present motions, the court finds that its time and resources are more appropriately allocated to the pending motion for a preliminary injunction rather than additional briefing on the present motion for a temporary restraining order. Therefore, the court shall deny the present motions as moot.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (ECF No. 43) and motion to shorten time (ECF No. 44) are DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 21st day of February, 2018.

January R. HICKS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE