

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Charm Hospitality LLC v. Nohayia Javed, et al.

Charm Hospitality · No. 2:25-cv-00282-RFB-BNW · Decided December 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada grants Defendant Javed’s motion to extend the rebuttal expert and discovery deadlines. The court finds good cause based on pending motions to quash and related discovery issues, denies the request for fees, and sets revised deadlines for discovery, rebuttal expert disclosures, dispositive motions, and the joint pretrial order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brenda Weksler
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 19, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00282-RFB-BNW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Javed moved to extend the rebuttal expert and discovery deadlines. Plaintiff opposed the motion, and Defendant replied.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court exercises broad discretion in supervising the pretrial phase and issuing and enforcing scheduling orders. Extension of an unexpired scheduling-order deadline requires good cause, assessed by whether the deadline could not reasonably be met despite diligence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendant established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 26-3 to extend the rebuttal expert and discovery deadlines.
2. Whether an award of fees was appropriate in connection with the requested extension.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted Defendant Javed's motion to extend the rebuttal expert and discovery deadlines because good cause existed.
2. The court denied the request for fees because the circumstances would make an award unjust.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The district court is given broad discretion in supervising the pretrial phase of litigation,” (at 1)

“A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a showing of good cause.” (at 1)

“The good cause analysis turns on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Three motions to quash were pending: one concerning documents sought by Defendants and two concerning depositions Defendants wished to take. The discovery process could be affected by rulings on those motions, and delays also involved a dispute over the manner of the meet-and-confer process. The requested extension was relatively short, no trial date was pending, and Plaintiff did not assert prejudice.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court considered Defendant Javed's motion to extend unexpired scheduling-order deadlines in light of three pending motions to quash, disputes concerning depositions and the meet-and-confer process, the absence of a pending trial date, and the lack of claimed prejudice. The court found good cause, granted the motion, denied the request for fees, and reset the discovery, expert-disclosure, dispositive-motion, and pretrial-order deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Zivkovic v. S. Cal. Edison Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)

OPINION

Javed

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

2 * * * 3 Charm Hospitality LLC, Case No. 2:25-cv-00282-RFB-BNW 4 Plaintiff,

5 ORDER

v. 6 Nohayia Javed, et al., 7 Defendants. 8 9 Before this Court is Defendant Javed's motion to extend the rebuttal expert and discovery 10 deadlines. ECF No. 91. Plaintiff opposed and Defendant replied. ECF Nos. 93 and 96. The parties 11 are familiar with the arguments. As a result, this Court only includes them as relevant and 12 necessary to this order. 13

I. ANALYSIS

14 "The district court is given broad discretion in supervising the pretrial phase of litigation," 15 including in issuing and enforcing scheduling orders. *Zivkovic v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d 16 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002). A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must 17 be premised on a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good 18 cause analysis turns on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the 19 exercise of diligence. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). 20 This Court finds there is good cause for the requested extension. There are three motions 21 to quash pending before this Court. ECF Nos. 74, 94, and 95. The first one regards documents 22 Defendants are seeking. The remaining two relate to depositions that Defendants wish to take. 23 The discovery process may be impacted based on this Court's orders on the motions referred to 24 above. Moreover, some of the delay surrounding the depositions Plaintiff is seeking to quash 25 involve the currently pending dispute regarding the manner in which the meet and confer process 26 is to take place. Lastly, the extension sought is not particularly long. No trial date is pending, and 27 Plaintiff is not arguing prejudice by the sought extension. Indeed, the exhibits in support of this 1 || request show Plaintiff was in agreement to the sought extension until a disagreement arose over 2 || what discovery would be undertaken. ! 3 The request for fees is denied as the circumstances would make the award unjust.

II. CONCLUSION

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Javed's motion (at ECF No. 91) is 6 || GRANTED. 7 Discovery Cut-Off: January 30, 2026 8 Rebuttal Expert Disclosures: January 23, 2026 9 Dispositive Motions: February 27, 2026 10 Joint Pretrial Order: March 27, 2026, or 30 days after ruling on dispositive 11 12 DATED: December 19, 2025 13 14 Li gum les Are Kn

BRENDA WEKSLER

15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 a7 While this does not support a showing of good cause, it undermines the strong position Plaintiff 28 || now takes.