

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
**Judge Philip A. Brimmer**

Civil Action No. 11-cv-00010-PAB-KMT  
(consolidated with 10-cv-01134-PAB-KMT)

GEORG K. HILL,  
Plaintiff,

v.

THE CITY OF AURORA, COLORADO, a municipal corporation,  
Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter is before the Court *sua sponte*. On June 8, 2011, the Court consolidated this action with Civil Action No. 10-cv-01134-PAB-KMT because, in each, plaintiff alleged substantially similar facts against the same defendant. See Docket No. 24. In Civil Action No. 10-cv-01134-PAB-KMT, plaintiff was ordered to “file an amended complaint consolidating the factual allegations and causes of action previously contained in the complaints” from both consolidated cases, see Docket No. 164 in No. 10-cv-01134-PAB-KMT, which plaintiff has now done. See Docket No. 169 in No. 10-cv-01134-PAB-KMT. Therefore, the Court discerns no reason to keep the present matter open during the pendency of Civil Action No. 10-cv-01134-PAB-KMT and will administratively close it pursuant to D.C.COLO.LCivR 41.2. In the event there is a reason that this case remain open, the parties may seek to have it reopened for good

cause. See D.C.COLO.LCivR 41.2.<sup>1</sup>

For the foregoing reasons, it is

**ORDERED** that this case is administratively closed.

DATED January 30, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/Philip A. Brimmer  
PHILIP A. BRIMMER  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup>To the extent defendant might seek to renew its request for attorney's fees, see Docket No. 32 at 2 (denying a request for fees for failure to comply with D.C.COLO.LCivR 54.3), the Court is empowered to address such collateral matters and will continue to have jurisdiction even after a dismissal and entry of judgment. See *Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Engida*, 611 F.3d 1209, 1218 (10th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 395 (1990)); cf. *Qureshi v. United States*, 600 F.3d 523, 525 (5th Cir. 2010) (“[T]he court may, notwithstanding dismissal of the underlying action, . . . impose attorney’s fees . . . .”) (citations and footnote omitted). Moreover, as noted, D.C.COLO.LCivR 41.2 permits the Court to reopen administratively closed matters for good cause.