

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
28

WO

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

JAN E. KRUSKA,

Plaintiff,

v.

PERVERTED JUSTICE FOUNDATION)
INCORPORATED, et. al.,

Defendant.

No. CV 08-0054-PHX-SMM

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Barbara Ochoa’s Motion to Strike Doc. 95 (Doc. 96). Defendant Ochoa requests that Plaintiff’s “Response to Defendant Barbara Ochoa’s Reply and [sic] Support of Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint Pursuant to Rules 4(m) and 12(b)(2), (3), and (5)” be stricken because briefing on the Motion to Dismiss ended on July 28, 2008 when Defendant Ochoa filed her Reply (Doc. 93). Defendant Ochoa contends that the Response is not allowed by either statute, rule, or court order and directs the Court to Local Rule 7.2(a)-(d).

Beginning on July 13, 2008, Defendant Ochoa filed a Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 88), followed by Plaintiff’s Response on July 17 (Doc. 91), and finally Defendant Ochoa’s Reply on July 28 (Doc. 93). Plaintiff then filed another Response to Defendant Ochoa’s Reply on July 30 (Doc. 95). Local Rule 7.2(c) states that there should be one “responsive memorandum” by the opposing party after a motion is filed. L.R.Civ. 7.2(c).

1 Moreover, Local Rule 7.2(d) allows the original filing party to file a reply memorandum.
2 L.R.Civ. 7.2(d). No further filings are permitted absent Court order. In accordance with
3 Rule 7.2, Plaintiff is allowed to file only a single Response to Defendants' Motion to
4 Dismiss. As a result, the Court will strike Plaintiff's Response to Defendant Ochoa's
5 Reply (Doc. 95), and Plaintiff's arguments in that motion will not be considered when
6 ruling on the pending Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendant Ochoa.

7 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED GRANTING** Defendant Barbara Ochoa's Motion
8 to Strike Doc. 95 (Doc. 96).

9 DATED this 15th day of November, 2008.

10 
11 _____
12 Stephen M. McNamee
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28