

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Maria Del Carmen Cortes-Reyes v. Enrique Herrera Carrasco, et al.

Cortes-Reyes · No. 2:25-cv-00323-GMN-NJK · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada considers the parties’ fifth stipulation to extend case management deadlines by 30 days. Although the parties did not adequately demonstrate diligence or good cause, the Court grants the extension and resets the expert disclosure, discovery, dispositive-motion, and pretrial-order deadlines.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nancy J. Keppe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00323-GMN-NJK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to extend case-management deadlines by 30 days. The court evaluated the request under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 26-3.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A request to extend unexpired scheduling-order deadlines requires good cause. Good cause depends on whether the deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence; the diligence inquiry considers the parties' conduct throughout the time already allowed and whether they promptly sought modification when the need became apparent.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; precedential status unknown.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) and Local Rule 26-3 to extend unexpired case-management deadlines.
2. Whether the court should grant a 30-day extension despite the parties' failure to make an adequate showing of diligence and good cause.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties failed to establish good cause because they did not explain why the deadlines could not reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence, and their stated need for additional time to review records, complete expert reports, and pursue settlement was insufficient.
2. The court granted the parties' stipulation and reset the case-management deadlines by 30 days, notwithstanding the inadequate good-cause showing, in an effort to resolve the case on its merits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

“The showing of diligence is measured by the conduct displayed throughout the entire period of time already allowed.” (at 1)

“When diligence has not been shown in support of an extension request, “the inquiry should end.”” (at 1)

“That a request is made jointly neither mandates allowance of the extension sought nor exempts parties from making the necessary showings to justify that relief.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties sought a 30-day extension to obtain and review records, complete expert reports, and engage in settlement discussions. This was their fifth request to extend case-management deadlines and their third such request since July 31, 2025. The parties did not explain beyond generally asserting the need for additional time why the deadlines could not reasonably be met despite diligent efforts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The scheduling order was entered on March 31, 2025. The parties had already made four prior requests to extend case-management deadlines, making the present stipulation their fifth request and their third request since July 31, 2025. Although the court found that the parties had not adequately shown diligence or good cause, it granted a 30-day extension to allow the case to be resolved on its merits and reset the scheduling deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Morgal v. Maricopa Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors, 284 F.R.D. 452, 460 (D. Ariz. 2012)
- Williams v. James River Grp. Inc., 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1177-78, 1180-81 (D. Nev. 2022)
- Jackson v. Laureate, Inc., 186 F.R.D. 605, 608 (E.D. Cal. 1999)
- Sharp v. Covenant Care LLC, 288 F.R.D. 465, 467 (S.D. Cal. 2012)
- Desio v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 339 F.R.D. 632, 641 (D. Nev. 2021)
- Janicki Logging Co. v. Mateer, 42 F.3d 561, 566 (9th Cir. 1994)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 7 8 MARIA DEL CARMEN CORTES-REYES, Case No. 2:25-cv-00323-GMN-NJK 9 Plaintiff, Order 10 v. [Docket No. 23] 11 ENRIQUE HERRERA CARRASCO, et al., 12 Defendants. 13 Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to extend case management deadlines 14 by 30 days. Docket No. 23. 15 A request to extend unexpired deadlines in the scheduling order must be premised on a 16 showing of good cause.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4); Local Rule 26-3. The good cause analysis turns 17 on whether the subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence. 18 Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). "The diligence 19 obligation is ongoing." Morgal v. Maricopa Cnty. Bd. of Supervisors, 284 F.R.D. 452, 460 (D. 20 Ariz. 2012). "The showing of diligence is measured by the conduct displayed throughout the entire 21 period of time already allowed." Williams v. James River Grp.

Inc., 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1177 22 (D. Nev. 2022). The Court considers whether relief from the scheduling order is sought based on 23 the development of matters that could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time the schedule 24 was established. Jackson v. Laureate, Inc., 186 F.R.D. 605, 608 (E.D. Cal. 1999). Courts may 25 also consider other pertinent circumstances, including whether the movant was diligent in seeking 26 modification of the scheduling order once it became apparent that the movant required relief from 27 the deadline at issue.

Sharp v. Covenant Care LLC, 288 F.R.D. 465, 467 (S.D. Cal. 2012). 28 "[C]arelessness is not compatible with a finding of diligence and offers no reason for a grant of 1 relief." Johnson, 975 F.2d at 609. When diligence has not been shown in support of an extension 2 request, "the inquiry should end." Id.1 Although the Court may consider the joint nature of a 3 stipulation to extend, "[t]hat a request is made jointly neither mandates allowance of the extension 4 sought nor exempts parties from making the necessary showings to justify that relief." Williams, 5 627 F. Supp. 3d at 1178.

6 The parties seek to extend case management deadlines by 30 days. Docket No. 23. The 7 instant stipulation is the parties' fifth request to extend case management deadlines in this matter. 8 See

Docket Nos. 11, 13, 17, 20, 23.

However, the stipulation incorrectly states that this is the 9 parties' fourth request for an extension of time. Docket No. 23 at 1; see also LR IA 6-1(a). The 10 scheduling order in this matter was entered on March 31, 2025. Docket No. 10. Since July 31, 11 2025, this is the parties' third request for an extension in which they submit that additional time is 12 needed to obtain and review records, complete expert reports, and engage in meaningful settlement 13 discussions.

See Docket Nos. 17 at 5-6, 20 at 6-7, 23 at 6-7. The parties fail to explain why the 14 subject deadlines cannot reasonably be met despite the exercise of diligence beyond merely 15 asserting that additional time is needed. See Docket No. 23 at 6-7; see also *Johnson v. Mammoth 16 Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). Further, the reasons provided are insufficient 17 to establish good cause.

See *Williams v. James River Grp. Inc.*, 627 F. Supp. 3d 1172, 1180-81 18 (D. Nev. 2022) (holding that needing more time to review medical records, craft expert reports, 19 and discuss possible settlement do not establish good cause); see also Docket No. 12 at 1-2 n.2 20 ("It is well-settled that the existence of settlement talks or alternative dispute resolution is generally 21 insufficient to establish good cause for extension of the case management deadlines").

22 Nonetheless, in an effort to resolve the case on its merits, the Court will afford the parties 23 a 30-day extension. The Court therefore GRANTS the parties' stipulation. Docket No. 23. Case 24 management deadlines are RESET as follows: 25 • Initial experts: January 22, 2026 26 1 The Ninth Circuit has emphasized the importance of scheduling orders, see *Desio v. State 27 Farm Mut.*

Auto. Ins. Co., 339 F.R.D. 632, 641 (D. Nev. 2011) (collecting cases), and has stated bluntly that Rule 16 scheduling orders must "be taken seriously," *Janicki Logging Co. v. Mateer*, 28 42 F.3d 561, 566 (9th Cir. 1994).] e Rebuttal experts: February 25, 2026 2 e Discovery cutoff: March 25, 2026 3 e Dispositive motions: April 23, 2026 4 e Joint proposed pretrial order: May 26, 2026, or 30 days after resolution of dispositive 5 motions 6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: December 5, 2025 Nancy J. Keppe — 9 United States Magistrate Judge 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28