

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

Civil Action No. 10-cv-00813-CMA-KMT

GUY PAQUET, and
ELIZABETH PAQUET,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MARK SMITH,

Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's "Motion for Order Regarding CM/ECF Compliance" [Doc. No. 8] filed June 7, 2010.

Plaintiff complains the Defendant's counsel is in violation of the Local Rules of this Court and has filed documents in violation of the procedures directing the use of the CM/ECF system. Specifically, Plaintiff asserts that Defendant's counsel did not affix a Colorado bar identification number to his CM/ECF signature block and that he did not file a separate entry of appearance as required, so Plaintiff alleges, by D.C.COLO.LCivR 11.1.

D.C.COLO.LCivR 11.1 provides

A. **Appearances.** An appearance by or on behalf of a party shall be made in open court or in a pleading, motion, entry of appearance, or other paper

Id. (emphasis added). Defendant's counsel appropriately entered his appearance in Doc. No. 4, Defendant's "Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support" filed May 20, 2010.

The United States District Court - District of Colorado, Electronic Case Filing Procedures (Civil Cases), ver. 3.0, eff. 12/01/07 provides

4. Signature Block. The correct format for a signature block is as follows:

s/ Pat Attorney
Pat Attorney
ABC Law Firm
123 South Street
Denver, CO 80202-1234
Telephone: (303) 555-5555
FAX: (303) 555-5554
E-mail: patattorney@xyz.com
Attorney for (Plaintiff/Defendant) XYZ Company

Id. at 9. As noted by Plaintiff, "[t]he requirements are specified in CM/ECF Rule V,C,4 (sic) and are easy to read and (sic) comprehend."¹ (Mot. at 2.) The rule does not compel an attorney to set forth his or her Colorado registration number in the signature block. The signature of Mr. Vermeire on Doc. No. 4 substantially complies with the rule.²

The court cautions the plaintiff that the filing of meaningless motions wastes judicial resources and increases the costs of litigation for the parties in violation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. In the future such filings could result in sanctions by the court where appropriate.

¹The motion is replete with typographical errors such as the ones noted. In fact, the certificate of service states that service was made on Richard S. *Merveire* instead of Richard S. Vermeire. Even the case number is formatted improperly.

²The signature block lacks the email address of Mr. Vermeire; however as an attorney authorized to file in CM/ECF, Mr. Vermeire's email address is part of the court record and is contained on the court docket as rvermeire@fclaw.com.

IT IS ORDERED

Plaintiff's "Motion for Order Regarding CM/ECF Compliance" [Doc. No. 8] is

DENIED.

Dated this 17th day of June, 2010.

BY THE COURT:



Kathleen M Tafoya
United States Magistrate Judge