

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 14-cv-03359-CMA-MJW

MARCUS LESSARD,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRACI CRAVITZ, *in her individual and official capacities*,
BOULDER POLICE DEPARTMENT, *a municipality*,
BOULDER DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, *a municipality*,
NATASHA ANDERSON, *f/k/a Natasha Young, in her individual and official capacities*,
KAREN LORENZ, *in her individual and official capacities*,
KAREN PETERS, *in her individual and official capacities*,
STEVEN LOUTH, *a private party in conspiracy with Boulder DA's Office Defendants*,
LIZ LAFEMINA, *a private party in conspiracy with Boulder Police Department Defendants*,

KERRY YAMAGUCHI, *in his individual and official capacities*,
JOHN DOE #1, *in his/her individual and official capacities*,
JOHN DOE #2, *in his/her individual and official capacities*,
LAEL MONTGOMERY, *in her individual and official capacities*,
THOMAS J. B. REED, *in his individual and official capacities*,
G. MULVANEY, *in his/her individual and official capacities*,
LUCY BATTON, *in her individual and official capacities*,
GORDON BROWN, *in his individual and official capacities*,
CASSANDRA HENRIKSON, *in her individual and official capacities*,
ERICA SOLANO, *in her individual and official capacities*,
JANE HARMER, *in her individual and official capacities*,
GORDON COOMBES, *in his individual and official capacities*,
MAGGIE GREEN, *in her individual and official capacities*,
MARK HUSMANN, *in his individual and official capacities*,
MARCIE LIEBERMAN, *in her individual and official capacities*,
DONNA TEAGUE, *in her individual and official capacities*,
TIM JOHNSON, *in his individual and official capacities*, and
STAN GARNETT, *in his individual and official capacities*,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (Docket No. 67) is DENIED.

The Court notes that it did, as Plaintiff supposes, overlook Plaintiff's filing of a response (docket no. 48) to Defendant Louth's original motion to dismiss (docket no. 18). Because Defendant Louth's original motion to dismiss has been denied as moot, Plaintiff's response to that motion is no longer operative. Thus, there is little to be gained from striking it and (as a practical matter) just as little to be gained from *not* striking it. That said, the response is properly part of the record of proceedings in this case, and the motion to strike it is therefore denied.

Date: March 27, 2015
