

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Judge Robert E. Blackburn**

Civil Case No. 10-cv-01881-REB-MJW

GREG SHRADER,

Plaintiff,

v.

EARIK BEANN,
WAVE 59 TECHNOLOGIES INT’L INC.,
WILLIAM BRADSTREET STEWART,
INSTITUTE OF COSMOLOGICAL ECONOMICS, and
SACRED SCIENCE INSTITUTE, and
WAVE 59 TECHNOLOGIES INT’L INC. OWNERS AND OFFICERS,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S WRITTEN OBJECTIONS
TO FEDERAL JUDGE BLACKBURNS (sic) ORDER DOCKET NO. 168**

Blackburn, J.

The matter before me is plaintiff’s **Written Objections to Federal Judge Blackburns (sic) Order Docket No. 168** [#175]¹ filed June 1, 2011. I am puzzled by this filing, which purports to object to an order of this court, but refers by docket number to the **Motion of Defendants Wave 59 Technologies Int’l Inc. and Earik Beann To Include Wave 59 Technologies Int’l Inc. Owners and Officers in Motion To Dismiss or, in the Alternative, for Leave To Amend Answer** [#168] filed May 24, 2011, which has been referred to the magistrate judge for consideration. (**See Memorandum** [#169] filed May 24, 2011.)

¹ “[#175]” is an example of the convention I use to identify the docket number assigned to a specific paper by the court’s electronic case filing and management system (CM/ECF). I use this convention throughout this order.

The substance of the motion takes issue with rulings of the court relating to plaintiff's motion for entry of default and default judgment against the purported defendant, Wave59 Technologies Int'l Inc. Owners and Officers. As I have found in relation to similar recent filings by plaintiff, those objections are moot in light of the court's **Order Sustaining Objection To Order of The United States Magistrate Judge** [#162] entered May 18, 2011. As ordered therein, the question whether entry of default should be made against this defendant, which was raised in **Plaintiff [sic] Request to Clerk of Court for Default in Accordance with F.R.C.P. 55** [#154] filed May 11, 2011, has been referred to the magistrate judge for further determination. The matter, therefore, is presently at issue and will be ruled on in due course. Thus the present objections are both duplicative and moot.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's **Written Objections to Federal Judge Blackburns** (sic) **Order Docket No. 168** [#175] filed June 1, 2011, are **DENIED AS MOOT.**

Dated June 7, 2011, at Denver, Colorado.

BY THE COURT:



Robert E. Blackburn
United States District Judge