

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

Civil Action No. 13-cv-02002-RM-BNB

ALLEN & VELLONE, P.C., and  
STRAUS & BOIES, LLP.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LAURENCE J. PINO,  
ENVERGENT CORPORATION, and  
JOHN DOE CORPORATION,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter arises on the following:

- (1) **Defendant Pino's Motion for Sanctions for Violation of Rule 11** [Doc. # 32, filed 12/9/2013] (the "Motion for Sanctions"); and
- (2) **Defendant Pino's Motion for Leave to File Reply** [Doc. # 37, filed 1/13/2014] (the "Motion to Reply").

The parties appeared this morning for a hearing on the motions. The Motion for Sanctions argues principally that the plaintiffs violated Rule 11 because "[t]he Amended Complaint alleges virtually no facts sufficient to support a reasonable inference that Pino engaged in conduct that subjects him to the jurisdiction of the Colorado courts." Motion for Sanctions [Doc. # 32] at p. 6. That also is the basis for Mr. Pino's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction [Doc. # 10], which is pending before the district judge and set for hearing before him this afternoon. Minute Order [Doc. # 35]. The Motion for Sanctions and the Motion

to Dismiss are intertwined, and I would not presume to anticipate the district judge's ruling.

Consequently, the Motion for Sanctions is premature until there is a ruling on the Motion to Dismiss.

IT IS ORDERED:

- (1) The Motion to Reply [Doc. # 37] is GRANTED; and
- (2) The Motion for Sanctions [Doc. # 32] is DENIED without prejudice as premature.

Dated January 16, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland  
United States Magistrate Judge