

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**

Alejandro Araiza,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

Milton Kent Mecham doing business as  
Mecham & Associates, Chartered,  
Defendant.

No. CV10-0188 PHX DGC

**ORDER**

\_\_\_\_\_

On June 17, 2010, Plaintiff Alejandro Araiza filed a motion for leave to file an amended complaint (Doc. 20). Defendant Milton Kent Mecham d/b/a Mecham & Associates, Chartered, did not file a response to the motion within the time period allowed by the Local Rules. *See* L.R. Civ. P. 7.2(c) (“The opposing party shall . . . have fourteen (14) days after service in a civil or criminal case within which to serve and file a responsive memorandum.”). The Court will treat Plaintiff’s lack of response as consent to the motion to amend pursuant to Rule 7.2(i) of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* L.R. Civ. P. 7.2(i) (stating that, if a party fails to “file the required answering memoranda,” “such non-compliance may be deemed a consent to the denial or granting of the motion and the Court may dispose of the motion summarily”).

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

**IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to amend (Doc. 20) is **granted**.

DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2010.



---

David G. Campbell  
United States District Judge