

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 11-cv-01268-WYD-MEH

GEORGE FARMER (a/k/a George L. Farmer),

Plaintiff,

v.

BANCO POPULAR OF NORTH AMERICA, and  
JOHN DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

---

**MINUTE ORDER**

---

**Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on December 5, 2011.**

Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend That is Less Than or Equal to Forty-Eight Pages [filed December 2, 2011; docket #67] is **granted in part and denied in part**. Pursuant to D.C. Colo. LCivR 7.1C, "a motion involving a contested issue of law shall state under which rule or statute it is filed and be supported by a recitation of legal authority *incorporated into the motion*." *Id.* (emphasis added). There is nothing in the rules permitting parties to file memoranda in support of motions.

In addition, the Court notes that after granting Defendant permission to file a 30-page motion to dismiss, Defendant filed a 26-page motion. *See* docket #63. Plaintiff contends that if his opposition to the motion is limited in length, "he might not be able to fully articulate his position, and might miss something and therefore could be prejudiced." However, the Court finds no good cause for Plaintiff's extensive page request based merely on speculation. Therefore, the Court denies Plaintiff's request to file a 48-page memorandum of law in opposition to the motion to dismiss and in support of a motion for leave to amend, which the Court finds may clutter or confuse the docket. Rather, the Court will grant Plaintiff leave to file a brief in opposition to the motion to dismiss that is no longer than thirty-five (35) pages. To the extent Plaintiff requires more pages than those granted by Judge Daniel's practice standards for any motion for leave to amend, he may request those by separate motion.