

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

OPINION

Cortes-Reyes

PER CURIAM.

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