

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

Civil Action No. 10-cv-02913-WYD-BNB

CHRISTOPHER JON MILLER,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARGARET HEIL, in her official capacity as Program Administrator of the SOTMP and Chief of Rehabilitation Programs,

RICHARD G. LINS, individual, and in his official capacity as SOTMP therapist, and litigation coordinator,

CHRISTINA ORTIZ-MARQUEZ, individually, and in her official capacity as SOTMP therapist, SAMUEL MICHAEL DUNLAP, in his official capacity as SOTMP Phase II Program Coordinator,

BURL MCCULLAR, in his official capacity as SOTMP Program Manager,

ARISTEDES ZAVAR[A]S, in his official capacity as Executive Director,

CHRISTINE TYLER, individually, and in her official capacity as SOTMP therapist, and

JAYLYNNE CHUPP, in her official capacity as SOTMP therapist,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter arises on the following motions (the “Motions”):

1. **Plaintiff’s Motion for Order** [Doc. #90, filed 08/23/2011] (the “Motion for Order”);
2. Plaintiff’s **Motion for Enlargement of Time to Respond to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint** [Doc. #104, filed 09/26/2011] (the “First Motion for Extension of Time”);
3. Plaintiff’s **Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint** [Doc. #111, filed 10/13/2011] (the “Second Motion for Extension of Time”);

4. The plaintiff's **Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint** [Doc. #114, filed 10/19/2011] (the "Third Motion for Extension of Time"); and

5. **Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss** [Doc. #123, filed 12/12/2011] (the "Motion to Strike").

In his Motion for Order, the plaintiff requests that the court order the defendants to answer or otherwise respond to his Second Amended Complaint. The defendants timely filed a motion to dismiss in response to the Second Amended Complaint. Accordingly, the Motion for Order is denied.

In his First, Second, and Third Motions for Extension of Time, the plaintiff seeks an extension of time to respond to the defendants' motion to dismiss. These extensions are granted.

The defendants' Motion to Strike seeks an order striking the plaintiff's response to the motion to dismiss. Although the plaintiff's response violates filing requirements and page limits, judicial economy compels that I consider the plaintiff's response in my analysis of the defendants' motion to dismiss. The plaintiff is warned, however, that future typewritten papers must be double-spaced and in not less than 12-point font. D.C.COLO.LCivR 10.1D and E.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Motion for Order [Doc. # 90] is DENIED;
2. The First, Second, and Third Motions for Extension of Time [Docs. ## 104, 111, and 114] are GRANTED;
3. The Motion to Strike [Doc. # 123] is DENIED; and

4. All future typewritten papers filed by the plaintiff must be double-spaced and in not less than 12-point font. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in sanctions, including dismissal of this case.

Dated February 21, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland
United States Magistrate Judge