 13 Dr 14 ANTHONY MITCHELL, LINDA MITCHELL, and MICHAEL MITCHELL, LINDA MITCHELL, and MICHAEL MITCHELL, 16 Plaintiffs, 17 vs. 18 CITY OF HENDERSON, NEVADA, et al., 19 Defendants. 20 21 21 COME NOW, the parties, by ar 23 hereby stipulate and agree that all dial 24 days. This is the second request for a 25 Pursuant to LR 26-4 and the 26 24, 2015, a party must show good 27 expiration of a discovery deadline. Second response to all dial 	ocument 66	Filed 08/21/15	Page 1 of 6	
 COME NOW, the parties, by ar hereby stipulate and agree that all dia days. This is the second request for a Pursuant to LR 26-4 and the 24, 2015, a party must show good expiration of a discovery deadline. Second response to all dia 	ISTRICT OF N , Ca ST TO	ase No.: 2:13-cv	-01154-APG-CWH D [PROPOSED] ORDEI OVERY DEADLINES ST)	R
28 therefore timely with respect to an us	scovery dead discovery ext Scheduling C cause for an cheduling Or	llines in this cas tension in this ca Order (#60) ent n extension wit rder at 2. This r	te be extended ninety ase. Tered in this case on A thin 21 days prior to	(90) April o the

Discovery already completed

Counsel for all parties attended the FRCP 26(f) conference and subsequently 2 1. made their initial disclosures. 3

In order to minimize any intervention required by the court to resolve 2. discovery disputes, the parties collaborated and agreed on a stipulated protective order (#61) to govern protection of certain confidential material identified in the initial disclosures.

Since the previous order granting an extension of the discovery deadlines, the 3. parties have exchanged requests for production of documents, requests for admissions and written interrogatories.

10 11

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

18

19

20

21

Discovery remaining to be completed

4. The parties have not completed depositions of witnesses, production of documents, interrogatories or admissions, or disclosure of expert witnesses.

Due to the large number of witnesses identified in the initial disclosures and 14 5. the complexity of this case, the parties agree that further discovery will be required before 15 Plaintiffs can properly, if at all, identify all of the Doe defendants named in the Complaint 16 so that the Complaint may be properly amended. 17

The parties stipulate and agree that due to the complexity of this case and the 6. large number of witnesses involved, good cause exists to extend all discovery deadlines by 90 additional days. This extension will afford the parties time to resolve discovery issues among themselves while minimizing intervention from the Court, and will promote the efficient administration of the case.

22 23 24

 $\left|\right|$

//

- $\left| \right|$ 25
- //
- 26 //
- // 27 //
- 28

1	Proposed schedule for the	completion of remainir	ng discovery		
2	 Proposed schedule for the completion of remaining discovery 7. The new discovery deadlines proposed by the parties are as follows: 				
3					
4		<u>Original deadline</u>	<u>New deadline</u>		
5	Discovery cutoff	December 14, 2015	March 14, 2016		
6	Motions to amend pleadings or add partie	s September 14, 2015	December 14, 2016		
7	Expert designations	October 14, 2015	January 12, 2016		
8	Rebuttal expert designations	November 15, 2015	February 14, 2016		
9	Interim status report	October 14, 2015	January 12, 2016		
10	Dispositive motions	January 11, 2016	April 11, 2016		
11	8. This stipulation for an extension of the discovery deadlines is made in good				
12	faith and not for the purpose of delay or for any other improper purpose.				
13					
14	DATED: August 20, 2015. COFER & GELLER, LLC BENJAMIN DURHAM LAW FIRM				
15					
16		/s/ Frank Cofer			
17	FRANK H. COFER III, ESQ.				
18		vada Bar No. 11362 NJAMIN DURHAM, ESQ.			
19	Nevada Bar No. 7684				
20	601 South Tenth Street				
21	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Plaintiffs				
22					
23	DATED: August 20, 2015.	LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAAR	D & SMITH LLP		
24		/s/ Robert Freeman			
25	Ē	OBERT W. FREEMAN, JR.			
26	ſ	Vevada Bar No. 3062	•. •		
27		385 S. Rainbow Blvd, Sı as Vegas, Nevada 89118	uite 600		
28		Attorneys for North Las Ve	egas Defendants		
		3			

	Case 2:13-cv-01154-APG-CWH Docur	nent 66 Filed 08/21/15 Page 4 of 6
1	1 DATED: August 20, 2015.	BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP
2		/s/ Tamara Peterson
3	3	
4	4	KIRK B. LENHARD, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 1437
5	5	Tamara Beatty Peterson, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 5218
6	6	100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600
7 8		Las Vegas, Nevada 89106 Attorneys for Henderson Defendants
9 10		
11		IT IS SO ORDERED.
12		DATED: August 21, 2015
13		1
14		Canalth
15	5 \\	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16		
17	7	
18		
19	9 \\	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28		
20	8 \\	
		4

	Case 2:13-cv-01154-APG-CWH Document 66 Filed 08/21/15 Page 5 of 6
1	<u>Order</u>
2	IT IS SO ORDERED.
3	Dated this day of August, 2015.
4	
5 6	
7	U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
23 24	
24 25	
-5 26	
27	
28	
	5
I	1

	Case 2:13-cv-01154-APG-CWH Document 66 Filed 08/21/15 Page 6 of 6					
1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE					
2	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 20th day of June, 2015, a true and correct copy of the					
3	foregoing document:					
4						
5	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINES (SECOND REQUEST)					
6	was sowed via the Count's CM/ECE system upon the following persons:					
7	was served via the Court's CM/ECF system upon the following persons:					
8	TAMARA BEATTY PETERSON Brownstein Hwett Ferber Schreek, LLP					
9	Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP 100 North City Parkway, Ste. 1600					
10	Las Vegas, Nevada 89106 Attorneys for Henderson Defendants					
11						
12	ROBERT W. FREEMAN, JR. Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith					
13	6385 South Rainbow, Suite 600 Las Vegas, NV 89118					
14	Attorneys for North Las Vegas Defendants					
15						
16	/s/ April Burt					
17	APRIL B. BURT					
18	An employee of COFER & GELLER, LLC					
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27 28						
20						
	6					