

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Prentice Williams,
Plaintiff,
vs.
State of Arizona, et al.,
Defendants.

) No. CV 09-711-PHX-FJM

) **ORDER**

The court has before it plaintiff's motion for a hearing on the admissibility of plaintiff's testimony (doc. 72). This is an action for alleged constitutional violations, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1985. We have previously granted defendants' motion for summary judgment and denied plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (doc. 74), and entered judgment in favor of defendants and against plaintiff (doc. 75).

Plaintiff now contends that defendants submitted an inaccurate copy of his deposition testimony in support of their motion for summary judgment (doc. 56-1). First, any objections to evidence offered in support of a motion for summary judgment should be raised in the opposing party's response to the summary judgment motion. See LRCiv. 7.2(m)(2). Plaintiff's citation to Rule 32(b), Fed. R. Civ. P. is irrelevant; that rule pertains to the use of deposition testimony in a hearing or trial. This motion is therefore improper under our local rules.

