

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 10-cv-01925-REB-KLM

RONALD NAGIM, and
JANET NAGIM,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STEPHEN IRVING,
JOSEPH E. ABRAHAM, JR.,
SANDRA ABRAHAM,
JOSEPH E. ABRAHAM, III,
ALICIA PELLERGRIN, and
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' **Motion for Stay of Proceedings to Enforce Judgment** [Docket No. 40; Filed September 7, 2010] (the "Motion"). The Court notes that the Motion is similar to ones filed by Plaintiff Ronald Nagim in two of his three pending cases before this Court: 10-cv-00328-PAB-KLM [#77], 10-cv-00329-PAB-KLM [#27]. The Motion, which is largely unintelligible, does not contain a certification that it was served upon Defendants as required by D.C.COLO.LCivR 5.1G. (requiring certificate of service that the motion was served upon opposing party). Despite the fact that Plaintiffs are proceeding *pro se*, they are required to comply with the rules of this Court. *Green v. Dorell*, 969 F.2d 915, 917 (10th Cir. 1992). The Motion is subject to denial on this basis alone. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED without prejudice**. All future motions filed by Plaintiffs must comply with the Federal and Local Rules of Civil Procedure. In addition, the Court notes that the legal basis for the Motion is unclear. The Court also notes that Motions to Dismiss are pending in this case which may resolve the matter prior to the setting of case deadlines [Docket Nos. 6 & 13]. Plaintiffs have responded to those motions [Docket No. 35]. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that **Plaintiffs shall not file any additional pleadings until the Court issues a recommendation on the pending Motions to Dismiss. Any pleadings filed in violation of this Order shall be stricken.**

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that given the filing of a Response to the pending Motions to Dismiss which is signed by both Plaintiffs, the Order to Show Cause [Docket No. 18] is **DISCHARGED**. Although the pleading does not comply with my prior Orders [Docket Nos. 18 & 28], Docket No. 35 is deemed to be Plaintiffs' Response for purposes of resolving the pending Motions to Dismiss.

Dated: September 8, 2010