IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

| Civil Action | No. | 07-cv-0 | 1712-M | ISK-MEH |
|--------------|-----|---------|--------|---------|
| | | | | |

PETER GEORGACARAKOS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILEY, et al.,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on February 27, 2009.

The Motion to Bar Defendant's Response filed by proposed-intervenor Casey Rodriguez [filed February 25, 2009; docket #522] and the Motion to Bar Defendant's Response filed by proposed-intervenor Richard Leverich¹ [filed February 25, 2009; docket #524] are **denied as moot**. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Leverich assert that they did not receive a copy of Defendants' response to their motions to intervene from Defendants; therefore, Mr. Rodriquez and Mr. Leverich argue that the response should be stricken. However, this Court has already ordered that a copy of the response be mailed to Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Leverich, and has extended the deadline for filing a reply to the response [docket #515]. A copy of the response was mailed to Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Leverich on February 20, 2009 [docket #516], and the reply deadline was extended to March 9, 2009. Therefore, Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Leverich have suffered no prejudice as a result of the delay in receiving a copy of the response and, thus, striking Defendants' response is not appropriate in this matter.

Similarly, Mr. Rodriguez' Motion for Extension of Time, Copies of Defendant's Responses to Docket #429, 437, & 438, and Order Directing Defendants to Allow Service of Filings to Peter Georgacarakos in Accordance [sic] Rules of Court [filed February 25, 2009; docket #523] and Mr. Leverich's Motion for Extension of Time, Copies of Defendant's Responses to Docket #429, 437, & 438, and Order Directing Defendants to Allow Service of Filings to Peter Georgacarakos in Accordance [sic] Rules of Court [filed February 25, 2009; docket #525] are denied. Mr. Rodriguez' and Mr. Leverich's requests for a copy of the response and for an extension of time within which to file a reply are moot in light of this Court's order [docket #515]. In addition, Mr. Rodriguez' and Mr. Leverich's requests for the Court "to order Defendants to allow all movants to file copies of

¹Mr. Leverich's motion is incomplete; however, the pages filed appear to be identical to those filed by Mr. Rodriguez; therefore, the Court will treat both motions as requesting the same relief.

motions, replies, etc. with Peter Georgacarakos in accordance with the rules of court" are denied for the following reasons: first, Mr. Rodriquez and Mr. Leverich may not make requests on behalf of other individuals; second, Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Leverich identify no court rule that supports their requests; and third, until Mr. Rodriguez and/or Mr. Leverich become a party to this case, they must file and serve all pleadings as individual proposed intervenors in accordance with this Court's rules.