

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.

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