

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 11-cv-00968-REB-KLM

KATHLEEN CHYTKA,

Plaintiff,

v.

WRIGHT TREE SERVICE, INC.,

Defendant.

MINUTE ORDER

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's **Motion to the Court That the Plaintiff Did Not Get a Copy by Email From the Defendant on Any Motions That They Want to Put in to the Court and the Defendant at Any Time Could Have Settled This Case. Plaintiff Does Not Know How to Get the Information on This From the Email From the Court. Plaintiff Is Just Seeking a Decision From the Court on Summary of Judgement or Jury Trial. A Motion to Not Strike the Plaintiff Motion Filed With the Court [sic]** [Docket No. 191; Filed February 6, 2013], and on Plaintiff's **Motion to the Court to Show Evidence Plaintiff Has For This Case. To Prove to the Court the Evidence Was Put in to the Court a Long Time Ago. This Is Only in Part for Evidence for This Case [sic]** [Docket No. 199; Filed February 19, 2013] (collectively, the "Motions").

Yet again, the Court notes that it has repeatedly reminded Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, that she must comply with D.C.COLO.LCivR 7.1A. See, e.g., [#36, #42, #45, #52, #67, #73, #85, #89, #148, #151, #170, #178, #184]. Plaintiff must tell the Court in her motions whether opposing counsel opposes the relief she requests or whether opposing counsel agrees to the relief she requests. Plaintiff must tell the Court when and how she has attempted to confer with Defendant over the content of her motions. The Motions do not provide this information. If Plaintiff does not understand this requirement, she must ask the Court how she can comply. Plaintiff has also been repeatedly warned that motions that do not comply with D.C.COLO.LCivR 7.1A. will be summarily stricken from the record. See, e.g., [#52, #73, #85, #89, #148, #151, #170, #178, #184]. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motions [#191, #199] are **STRICKEN**.

However, as a courtesy to Plaintiff, the Court notes that, despite the titles of the Motions, Plaintiff's main requests for relief are for the Court to issue a decision on the Motions for Summary Judgment [#81; #115]. See [#191] at 4; [#199] at 27. The District Judge issued an Order [#197] regarding the Motions for Summary Judgment on February 15, 2013, so Plaintiff's primary concerns appear to be moot.

Dated: February 21, 2013