

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

OPINION

1 WO 2 3 4 5 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF
ARIZONA 8 9 LeTip World Franchise LLC, No. CV-24-00165-PHX-KML 10 Plaintiff, ORDER
11 v. 12 Long Island Social Media Group LLC, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 The parties seek
significant extensions to certain case management deadlines. (Doc. 15 140.)

The parties explain they chose to complete only “some discovery prior to the 16 September 12
ruling on the Second Motion to Dismiss” because they concluded “[i]t would 17 have been
premature, and inefficient, to engage in discovery on the counterclaims” before 18 the court
resolved the motion to dismiss. (Doc. 140 at 3-4.)

The parties claim they were 19 planning to seek the extensions earlier, but they were busy or
distracted. The parties 20 effectively admit they knew as of September 12, 2025, that extensions
of deadlines would 21 be needed but chose to wait until all deadlines had expired and the court
issued an order 22 requiring the parties act. Such behavior does not show diligence.

See Johnson v. Mammoth 23 Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992) (“If [party
seeking modification of 24 scheduling order] was not diligent, the inquiry should end.”). 25 The
court’s general practice is to require the filing of dispositive motions no later 26 than two years
after a case was filed. This case was filed on January 23, 2024, and the 27 claims are
straightforward.

(Doc. 1.) All discovery on the main claims should have been 28 completed months ago and the
remaining counterclaim—which the court permitted to 1 proceed in September—will not require
extensive discovery. Therefore, requiring 2 dispositive motions as close as possible to the two-
year mark is appropriate. But the court 3 allows for a slight extension in this case so the parties
can complete discovery they believe 4 is crucial.

These deadlines will not be extended again absent extraordinary circumstances. 5 None of the
circumstances counsel list in their current stipulation would qualify as 6 extraordinary, and nor
will settlement discussions. 7 IT IS ORDERED the Stipulation (Doc. 140 is GRANTED IN PART.

The 8 following deadlines apply: 9 • Fact discovery shall be completed no later than February 6,
2026. 10 • The party with the burden of proof on an issue shall provide full and complete expert

11 disclosures, as required by Rule 26(a)(2)(A)-(C) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, no later than January 12, 2026. 13 • The responding party (not having the burden of proof on the issue) shall provide full 14 and complete expert disclosures, as required by Rule 26(a)(2)(A)-(C) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, no later than January 23, 2026.

16 • The party with the burden of proof on the issue shall make its rebuttal expert 17 disclosures, if any, no later than January 30, 2026. Rebuttal experts shall be limited 18 to responding to opinions stated by the opposing party's experts. 19 • Expert depositions shall be completed no later than February 6, 2026. All expert 20 depositions shall be scheduled to commence at least five working days before this 21 deadline.

22 • Dispositive motions shall be filed no later than February 18, 2026. 23 • All parties and their counsel shall meet in person and engage in good faith settlement 24 talks no later than February 9, 2026. 25 / 26 / 27 / 28 / 1 e Plaintiff shall file notice of trial readiness no later than February 25, 2026, if no 2 dispositive motions are pending on that date.

If dispositive motions are pending, 3 plaintiff shall file and serve such notice within seven days after the resolution of the 4 dispositive motions. 5 Dated this 31st day of December, 2025. 6 Honorable Krissa M. Lanham 9 United States District Judge 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 -3-