

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 14-cv-02217-CMA-MJW

REBECCA HENKEL,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALBERTSONS, LLC, a limited liability corporation formed pursuant to the laws of  
Delaware,

Defendant.

---

MINUTE ORDER

---

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby ORDERED that Docket No. 32 is DENIED AS NOT A PROPER MOTION.

On April 8, 2015, the Clerk of Court entered a Notice of Noncompliance with Court Rules/Procedures notifying counsel for Defendant that Docket No. 30 (Defendant's response to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery) failed to comply with the Court's CM/ECF e-filing procedures; Chambers has not checked with the Clerk's office as to why the notice was entered, but assumes it is at least in part because the document was e-filed using the login credentials of a different attorney than the attorney whose electronic signature appears on the document.

The Notice of Noncompliance did not strike Docket No. 30; it simply warned counsel that future noncompliance would lead to mandatory e-filing training. Nonetheless, Defendant filed the document at Docket No. 32, which appears to be an exact copy of the document previously filed at Docket No. 30. The document was filed through CM/ECF as a motion, but it appears to be simply a response to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery. It requests no relief from the Court. Accordingly, it is not a motion, and the Court will deny it as not a proper motion.

For purposes of completing briefing on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery, the Court will continue to treat Docket No. 30 as the operative response. Plaintiff's reply (if any) will be due under D.C.COLO.LCivR 7.1(d), as computed from the date of service of Docket No. 30, *not* Docket No. 32.

Date: April 9, 2015

---