

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

Civil Action No. 09–cv–00309-MSK-KMT

SUZANNE SHELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

LEONARD HENDERSON,
FAMILIES AT RISK DEFENSE ALLIANCE,
FRANCINE RENEE CYGAN,
MARK CYGAN,
ILLINOIS FAMILY ADVOCACY COALITION,
GEORGIA FAMILY RIGHTS, INC.,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FAMILY ADVOCATES,
CONNECTICUT DCF WATCH,
BRENDA SWALLOW, and
RANDALL BLAIR,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ORDER ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KATHLEEN M. TAFOYA

“Plaintiff’s Fourth Motion for Sanctions Against Defendant Swallow for Failure to Obey Court Order [910]” (Doc. No. 928, filed December 18, 2013) is DENIED as duplicative of Document 918.

Plaintiff’s “Sixth Motion for Sanctions as to Defendant Swallow for Violation of the Protective Order [788]” (Doc. No. 953, filed January 7, 2013) and “Seventh Motion for Sanctions as to Defendant Swallow for Violation of the Protective Order [788]” (Doc. No. 960, filed January 7, 2013) are DENIED. Plaintiff raised the issues she objects to in her various motions. Defendant Swallow’s inadvertent responses to these motions, without actual disclosure of any protected documents, is not a violation of the Protective Order.

“Defendant Swallow’s Motion to Compel Plaintiff to Produce Source of Evidence” (Doc. No. 970, filed January 9, 2013) is DENIED, as it is irrelevant. Similarly, “Defendant Swallow’s Motion to Have Evidence Declared Inadmissible” (Doc. No. 972, filed January 10, 2013) is DENIED. As the court has previously advised the parties, it will not deal with issues extraneous to the issues in this case. To the extent the parties feel they have been the victims of illegal activity, they may contact the appropriate law enforcement authorities.

“Defendant Swallow’s Motion to Compel Source of Allegations” (Doc. No. 988, filed January 14, 2013) is DENIED, as it is irrelevant.

“Defendant Swallow’s Motion to Have Plaintiff’s Associated Corporations and Organizations Secure Competent and Lawful Legal Counsel” (Doc. No. 997, filed January 16, 2013) is DENIED. The court will not compel any party, including the defendants, to retain counsel. Moreover, the court has no jurisdiction over nonparties to this case.

“Plaintiff’s Motion to Matters as Admitted as to Defendant Henderson and for Other Relief” (Doc. No. 952, filed January 7, 2013) is DENIED. Plaintiff has raised these same issues and more issues in her subsequently-filed “Second Motion to Compel Henderson to Respond to Discovery Request, for Sanctions and to Deem Matters Admitted” (Doc. No. 1001, filed January 20, 2013). The court will deal with Plaintiff’s later motion in a separate order.

Dated: January 25, 2013