

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland

Civil Action No. 10-cv-01853-WYD-BNB

SANFORD B. SCHUPPER,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBYN CAFASSO, in his individual and official capacity,
WILLIAM EDIE, in his individual and official capacity,
JEANIE SMITH, in her individual and official capacity,
DAVID ZOOK, in his individual and official capacity,
JOHN NEWSOME, in his individual and official capacity,
DAN MAY, in his individual and official capacity,
LINDA DIX, in her individual and official capacity,
RAYMOND SANTISTEVAN, in his individual and official capacity,
RONALD WILKINS, in his individual and official capacity,
ANDREA WALTON, in her individual and official capacity,
DEBBI PARR, in her individual and official capacity,
JOHN RUSZCZYK in his individual and official capacity, and
JOHN DOE, JANE DOES, DOES 1-X,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter arises on the following motions filed by the plaintiff:

1. **Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed with Limited Discovery** [Doc. #104, filed 01/30/2012] (the "Motion for Discovery"); and
2. A letter addressed to "Gentle People" [Doc. #122, filed 05/09/2012].

In his Motion for Discovery, the plaintiff requests that he be permitted to conduct "limited discovery" to "challenge the previously issued Recommendations of Magistrate Judge and subsequent Order(s) of the United States Federal District Judge with respect to said

Recommendations.” The plaintiff does not identify the information he seeks or why it is relevant to such challenges. In addition, the district judge subsequently issued an order [Doc. #119] permitting the plaintiff to file a limited challenge and ordering that the plaintiff be provided with specific documents. Accordingly, the plaintiff’s Motion for Discovery is denied.

In his letter, the plaintiff seeks an extension of time to file a reply in support of his “Motion for De Novo Review” [Doc. #116]. The Motion for De Novo Review was denied on April 24, 2012. Therefore, the plaintiff’s request is moot. In addition, “[a] request for a court order must be made by motion.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1). The plaintiff may not seek a court order through letters. All requests must be made in the form of a motion, and the request must be titled as a motion. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Motion for Discovery [Doc. #104] is DENIED;
2. The plaintiff’s request for an extension of time [Doc. #116] is DENIED; and
3. All future applications to the court for relief shall be submitted in the form of a motion in compliance with Rule 7.

Dated July 10, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland
United States Magistrate Judge