

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 Court Has Subject Authority and Jurisdiction Over All Claims Under All the Government Civil Rights Laws That Protect the Pro Se Plaintiff on the Grounds That the Court Has Had This Case With the Plaintiff Pro Se for Around 1 Year and 8 Months on the Following Grounds** [Docket No. 216; Filed March 21, 2013] and on Plaintiff's **Motions to the court that the Plaintiff motions appose objects to the motion to strike the Plaintiff training charge and any an all other charges the Pro Se plaintiff has against the Defendant on the grounds that I did not even get any information from the Defendant attorney on some of the thing they planned on striking until I got it from the court like Dismissing the Pro Se's training Charge against the defendant. I have been doing things the same way the Defendants attorney has been doing to me. 2. Plaintiffs motion to the court that the court has proof that the Plaintiff has asked the Defendant attorneys if the Defendant wanted to talk settlement in emails and on the phone and the defendant Attorneys many times and Plaintiff was denied by the Defendants attorneys talking to me and just state that the defendant does not want to settle.** [Docket No. 217; Filed March 22, 2013] (collectively, the "Motions").

Neither of the Motions, even if each were construed as a Response, appears to substantively address the issues raised by Defendants in their Motion to Dismiss [#207]. Further, as a preliminary matter, the Motions do not comply with D.C.COLO.LCivR 7.1A., which provides as follows:

The Court will not consider any motion, other than a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 or 56, unless counsel for the moving party or a *pro se* party, before

filing the motion, has conferred or made reasonable, good faith efforts to confer with opposing counsel or a *pro se* party to resolve the disputed matter. The moving party shall state in the motion, or in a certificate attached to the motion, the specific efforts to comply with this rule.

As Plaintiff has been told many times before [#36, #42, #45, #52, #67, #73, #85, #89, #148, #151, #170, #178, #184, #198, #202, #206], on this basis alone, the Motions are subject to being stricken. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motions [#216, #217] are **STRICKEN** for failure to comply with Local Rule 7.1A.

Dated: March 28, 2013