

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 15-cv-00635-CMA-KLM

JOEL RAGUINDIN, and
JENNA FOX,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICHAEL YATES, individually,
JASON PHIPPS, individually,
MIKE PARKOS, individually,
PATRICK HAUGSE, individually,
CHIEF OF POLICE RICK BRANDT, in his official capacity,
WELD COUNTY SHERIFF STEVEN REAMS, individually and in his official capacity, and
PAUL WOOD, individually,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on **Defendants Reams and Wood's Motion for Relief From Court's May 15, 2015 Minute Order** [#31]¹ (the "First Motion") and **Defendants Reams and Wood's Amended Motion for Relief From the Court's May 15, 2015 Minute Order** [#36] (the "Second Motion").

The First Motion is superceded by the Second Motion, which corrected a date. Accordingly, the First Motion [#31] is moot.

The Second Motion is unopposed. *Second Motion* [#36] at 1. In the Motion, the moving Defendants argue that because they did not waive service until after the Second Amended Complaint was filed, their deadline to respond to the Second Amended Complaint is governed by Fed R. Civ. P. 4(d)(3) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A)(ii). As a result, they argue that the deadline for all Defendants to respond to the Second Amended

¹ "[#31]" is an example of the convention I use to identify the docket number assigned to a specific paper by the Court's case management and electronic case filing system (CM/ECF). I use this convention throughout this Minute Order.

Complaint set by the Court, *Minute Order* [#21] at 2, should be modified as to these two Defendants. *Second Motion* [#36] at 1-2.

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the First Motion [#31] is **DENIED as moot** and the Second Motion [#36] is **GRANTED**. Defendants Reams and Wood shall respond to the Second Amended Complaint [#22] **on or before July 13, 2015**.

Dated: June 9, 2015