

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 15-cv-01826-MEH

DEREK M. RICHTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF COMMERCE CITY, COLORADO,  
TROY SMITH, in his individual capacity,  
DAVID CUBBAGE, in his individual capacity, and  
KAREN STEVENS, in her individual capacity,

Defendants.

---

**MINUTE ORDER**

---

**Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on February 24, 2016.**

The Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents, Information, or Objects or to Permit Inspection of Premises in a Civil Action [filed February 22, 2016; docket #40] is **denied without prejudice** for failure to comply with D.C. Colo. LCivR 7.1(a), which states,

Before filing a motion, counsel for the moving party or an unrepresented party shall confer or make reasonable good faith efforts to confer with any opposing counsel or unrepresented party to resolve any disputed matter. The moving party shall describe in the motion, or in a certificate attached to the motion, the specific efforts to fulfill this duty.

The motion does not fall under any exception listed in D.C. Colo. LCivR 7.1(b). The Court reminds the parties of their continuing obligations to comply fully with D.C. Colo. LCivR 7.1(a). *See Hoelzel v. First Select Corp.*, 214 F.R.D. 634, 636 (D. Colo. 2003) (because Rule 7.1(a) requires meaningful negotiations by the parties, the rule is not satisfied by one party sending the other party a single email, letter or voicemail).