

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8
9 Teimuraz Tsirekidze et al,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 Syntax-Brilliant Corp. et al,

13 Defendant.
14

) No. CV-07-2204-PHX-FJM

) **ORDER**

15
16 Final judgment entered in this case nearly seven years ago back in 2010. See docs. 377
17 and 378. We have been presented with voluminous filings by pro se Ahmed Amr which do
18 not conform to the rules of court. We have before us a thick document which the clerk has
19 characterized as a Notice (doc. 383), a motion to disqualify lead plaintiff (doc. 384),
20 plaintiff’s response to the motion (doc. 385), Amr’s reply (doc. 386), and another document
21 characterized by the clerk as a Notice (doc. 387).

22 The motion to disqualify lead plaintiff is not a proper post judgment motion. Even if we
23 were to construe it as a motion for relief from judgment under Rule 60, Fed. R. Civ. P., it
24 comes too late. A motion under Rule 60(b)(1), (2), and (3) must be filed no more than a year
25 after the entry of judgment. Rule 60(c)(1). And all other motions under Rule 60 must be
26 made within “a reasonable time.” *Id.* The final judgment in this case is almost seven years
27 old. Six to seven years is not reasonable under any circumstance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

For these reasons, it is ORDERED DENYING the motion to disqualify lead plaintiff.
(Doc. 384).

This case is over, closed and terminated. There should be no further filings in it. Any future relief, if any, would have to be by independent action. Rule 60(d), Fed. R. Civ. P. We urge Mr. Amr to seek the advice of counsel.

DATED this 26th day of October, 2016.

Frederick J. Martone
Frederick J. Martone
Senior United States District Judge