

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

**Hardeep Sull v. State of Nevada, ex rel. Nevada State Board of Dental
Examiners, et al.**

Sull · No. 2:24-cv-02234-JAD-NJK · Decided January 8, 2026

OPINION

Sull

PER CURIAM.

1 2

3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 Hardeep Sull, 6 Case No.: 2:24-cv-02234-JAD-NJK Plaintiff, 7 Order v. 8 [Docket No. 65] State
of Nevada, ex rel. Nevada State Board 9 of Dental Examiners, et al., 10 Defendants. 11 Pending
before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to compel subpoena and deposition.1 Docket

12 No. 65. The Court has considered Plaintiff’s motion and Defendant State of Nevada, ex rel.

13 Nevada Board of Dental Examiners’ response. Docket Nos. 65, 71. No reply is necessary. The
14 motion is properly resolved without a hearing. See Local Rule 78-1. 15 “Discovery is supposed
to proceed with minimal involvement of the Court.” F.D.I.C. v. 16 Butcher, 116 F.R.D. 196, 203
(E.D. Tenn. 1986). Counsel should strive to be cooperative, 17 practical, and sensible, and should
seek judicial intervention “only in extraordinary situations that 18 implicate truly significant
interests.” In re Convergent Techs. Securities Litig., 108 F.R.D. 328, 19 331 (N.D. Cal. 1985).

Discovery motions will not be considered “unless the movant (1) has made 20 a good faith effort
to meet and confer . . . before filing the motion, and (2) includes a declaration 21 setting forth the
details and results of the meet-and-confer conference about each disputed 22 discovery request.”

Local Rule 26-7(c). 23 Judges in this District have held that the rules require that the movant must
“personally 24 engage in two-way communication with the nonresponding party to meaningfully
discuss each 25 1 While Plaintiff is proceeding in this case pro se, her filings are not entitled to
any special 26 leniency because she herself is an attorney. Crockett v. Cal., 2012 WL 2153801, at
*3 (C.D. Cal. May 22, 2012); see also Andrews v. Columbia Gas Transmission Corp., 544 F.3d
618, 633 (6th

27 Cir. 2008); Mann v. Boatright, 477 F.3d 1140, 1148 n.4 (10th Cir. 2007); Holtz v. Rockefeller
&

Co., 258 F.3d 62, 82 n.4 (2d Cir. 2001); Godlove v. Bamberger, Foreman, Oswald, and Hahn, 903
28 F.2d 1145, 1148 (7th Cir. 1990); Olivares v. Martin, 555 F.2d 1192, 1194 n.1 (5th Cir. 1977). 1}
contested discovery dispute in a genuine effort to avoid judicial intervention.” ShuffleMaster, Inc.
2|| v. Progressive Games, Inc., 170 F.R.D. 166, 171 (D. Nev. 1996). The consultation obligation 3]

“promote[s] a frank exchange between counsel to resolve issues by agreement or to at least narrow 4] and focus the matters in controversy before judicial resolution is sought.” Nevada Power v. 5] Monsanto, 151 F.R.D. 118, 120 (D.Nev.1993). To meet this obligation, parties must “treat the 6] informal negotiation process as a substitute for, and not simply a formalistic prerequisite to, 7] judicial resolution of discovery disputes.” /d. This is done when the parties “present to each other 8] the merits of their respective positions with the same candor, specificity, and support during the 9] informal negotiations as during the briefing of discovery motions.” /d. To ensure that parties 10] comply with these requirements, movants must file certifications that “accurately and specifically 11] convey to the court who, where, how, and when the respective parties attempted to personally resolve the discovery dispute.” ShuffleMaster, 170 F.R.D. at 170.2 Courts may look beyond the 13] certification made to determine whether a sufficient meet-and-confer actually took place. Cardoza 14] v. Bloomin’ Brands, Inc., 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1145 (D. Nev. 2015). 15 The instant dispute turns on Plaintiffs desire to depose a non-party, Dr. David Lee. See Docket No. 65. The motion identifies certain conferral efforts with Defendant, see, e.g., id. at 9- 17] 10, Plaintiff identifies no conferral efforts with Dr. Lee and/or his counsel, and there is no indication that Defendant represents Dr. Lee. See, e.g., id.; Docket No. 71. Further, Plaintiff has 19] failed to file a certification that counsel engaged in fulsome personal consultation regarding the 20] requested deposition of Dr. Lee. Finally, Plaintiff served the instant motion on Defendant, but 21] there is no indication that she served it on Dr. Lee and/or his counsel. See Docket No. 65 at 19. 22 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion is DENIED without prejudice. Docket No. 65. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 Dated: January 8, 2026. “ten NancyJ. Koppe 26 United States Magistrate Judge * These requirements are now largely codified in the Court’s local rules. See Local Rule 28] 26-7(c), Local Rule IA 1-3(f).