

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.

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.

IL. 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.