

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

LeTip World Franchise LLC v. Long Island Social Media Group LLC, et al.

LeTip World Franchise · No. CV-24-00165-PHX-KML · Decided December 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona partially grants the parties’ stipulation seeking extensions of case management deadlines. The court sets deadlines for discovery, expert disclosures and depositions, dispositive motions, settlement discussions, and notice of trial readiness, and warns that further extensions will not be granted absent extraordinary circumstances.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Krissa M. Lanham
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	December 31, 2025
DOCKET	CV-24-00165-PHX-KML
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly sought substantial extensions of case-management deadlines, including discovery, expert-disclosure, dispositive-motion, settlement, and trial-readiness deadlines.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A request to modify a scheduling order requires diligence; if the requesting party was not diligent, the inquiry ends. The court also evaluated whether extraordinary circumstances justified any further extension.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties demonstrated sufficient diligence to justify modification of the case-management schedule.
2. Whether the court should grant extensions of the discovery, expert-disclosure, dispositive-motion, settlement, and trial-readiness deadlines.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties did not demonstrate diligence because they knew extensions were needed but waited until all deadlines had expired before seeking relief.
2. The stipulation was granted in part, with limited extensions for fact discovery, expert disclosures and depositions, dispositive motions, settlement discussions, and trial-readiness notice; no further extensions would be granted absent extraordinary circumstances.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“If [party seeking modification of scheduling order] was not diligent, the inquiry should end.” (at 2)

“These deadlines will not be extended again absent extraordinary circumstances.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties completed only some discovery before the court's September 12, 2025 ruling on a second motion to dismiss because they believed discovery on the counterclaims would have been premature and inefficient. They acknowledged that they knew extensions would be needed as of that date but waited until all deadlines had expired and the court ordered them to act. The court concluded that the claims were straightforward, discovery on the main claims should have been completed earlier, and the remaining counterclaim would not require extensive discovery.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was filed on January 23, 2024. After the court ruled on a second motion to dismiss on September 12, 2025, the parties sought extensions after existing deadlines had expired, explaining that they had deferred discovery on the counterclaims. The court found that the parties had not acted diligently, but granted the stipulation in part to allow limited additional discovery and set new deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)