

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CITY BOXING CLUB v. USA BOXING, INC. dba USA BOXING

No. 2:23-cv-00708-JAD-DJA, United States District Court for the District of Nevada (December 11, 2025)

OPINION

1 Daniel R. Price (NV Bar No. 13564) Christopher Beckstrom (NV Bar No. 14031) 2 Janice J. Parker (NV Bar No. 14102) PRICE & BECKSTROM 3 1404 S. Jones Blvd. Las Vegas, Nevada 89146 4 Phone: (702) 941-0503 Fax: (702) 832-4026 5 info@pbnv.law Attorneys for Plaintiffs 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 8 CITY BOXING CLUB, et al., Case No.: 2:23-cv-00708-JAD-DJA 9 Plaintiffs, STIPULATION AND ORDER EXTENDING TIME FOR RESPONSE 10 v. AND REPLY REGARDING DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS 11 USA BOXING, INC. dba USA BOXING, et al., 12 Defendants.

13 THE PARTIES, by and through undersigned counsel, stipulate and agree to extend the time 14 for responses and replies regarding Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, Defendant 15 Scottsdale Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the Alternative, Partial 16 Summary Judgment, K&K Insurance Group's Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the Alternative, 17 Partial Summary Judgment, and USA Boxing's Motion for Summary Judgment.

[Respectively ECF 18 Nos. 111, 107, 108, and 109]. 19 The parties previously stipulated, and the Court granted, an extension of this briefing 20 schedule. [See ECF No. 115.] The parties now seek this additional extension. 21 All of the parties agree that an additional extension of the briefing schedule is warranted 22 because this is a complex case and because the pending dispositive motions are lengthy and dense.

23 In addition, a discovery motion [ECF No. 102], is currently pending before the Court and 24 1 motions. Defendants, on the other hand, do not believe that resolution of that pending discovery 2 motion is necessary to complete the briefing for the pending dispositive motions. But Defendants 3 are nonetheless agreeable to an extension of the existing briefing schedule for those dispositive 4 motions as set forth below.

5 In light of the forgoing, the parties seek the following extension of time for response and 6 reply briefs regarding each of the dispositive motions mentioned above: 7 8 / / / This intentionally left blank. Signatures on following page. 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 1 Van Damme v. Scottsdale, et. al. 2:23-cv-00708-JAD-DJA 2 SAO to Extend MSJ Briefing 3 Current Deadline Proposed Deadline 4 Dispositive Motions: | October 6, 2025 Passed 5 Response: December 22, 2025 February 5, 2026 6 Reply: January 26, 2026 March 12, 2026 7 Dated: December 11, 2025.

Dated: December 11, 2025. 8 /s/ Daniel Price /s/ Wing Yan Wong (with permission) 9 || Daniel R. Price, Esq. Wing Yan Wong, Esq. Christopher Beckstrom, Esq. Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani, LLP 10 || Janice Parker, Esq. 300 S. 4TM Street, Suite 1550 Krysa Scully, Esq. Las Vegas, NV 89101 11 || PRICE & BECKSTROM 1404 S. Jones Blvd. Stephen A. Hess, Esq. 12 || Las Vegas, Nevada 89146 Law Office of Stephen A. Hess, P.C.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs 111 South Tejon, Suite 102 13 Colorado Springs, CO. 80903 Attorneys for USA Boxing, Inc. 14 |} Dated: December 11, 2025. 15 /s/ Brian Pelanda (with permission) Christine M. Emanuelson, Esq. 16 || Nicole Hampton, Esq. Brian L. Pelanda, Esq. 17 || Hines Hampton Pelanda LLP 400 South 4" Street 18 || Las Vegas, NV 89101 Attorneys for Scottsdale Insurance Company, 19 || and K&K Insurance Group 20 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. awe ☐☐ ☐ 23 JENNIFER A. DORSEY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 24 DATED:12-11-25