Wilson v. Holst Doc. 52

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO Magistrate Judge Kathleen M. Tafoya

Civil Action No. 08-cv-01355-REB-KMT

STEVEN WILSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CATHY HOLST, individually,

Defendant.

MINUTE ORDER

ORDER ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KATHLEEN M. TAFOYA

Plaintiff's "Motion for Stay of Proceedings" (# 50, filed April 27, 2009) is DENIED. Plaintiff seeks a stay on this court's recommendation regarding the pending motion to dismiss (doc. no. 21) so he may interview and hire private counsel. The motion to dismiss was filed on December 4, 2008. Plaintiff filed his response on March 16, 2009 (doc. no. 38), after being granted three extensions of time within which to file the response (doc. nos. 27, 31, 35). Defendant filed her reply on April 3, 2009. The court sees no reason to stay its recommendation on the motion to dismiss or to stay the case.

Moreover, Plaintiff failed to confer with the defendant before filing his present motion. The Tenth Circuit has cautioned that pro se litigants "must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants." *Green v. Dorrell*, 969 F.2d 915, 917 (10th Cir. 1992) ("[W]e have repeatedly upheld dismissals in situations where the parties themselves neglected their cases or refused to obey court orders."(citing cases)). The Local Rules of Practice for the District of Colorado require all parties to confer on motions and other disputes before a motion is filed. D.C.Colo.LCivR 7.1A; *see also Visor v. Sprint*, 1997 WL 796989 (D. Colo. 1997).

Dated: April 29, 2009