

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 15-cv-02022-REB-KLM

AUDRENE BROWN,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLIED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
WALDO R. DAGLE, and
HERBERT A. ZIMMERMAN,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's **Motion to Strike Defendants' Answers** [#19] (the "Motion"). No response was filed.

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motion [#19] is **GRANTED**. Accordingly,

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the Answer [#13] filed by Defendant Applied Technologies, Inc. is **STRICKEN**. A corporation, partnership, or other legal entity "may not appear without counsel admitted to the bar of this court" D.C.COLO.LAttyR 6. Accordingly,

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that Defendant Applied Technologies Inc. shall have through **February 9, 2016** for new counsel to enter an appearance in this matter. Defendant Applied Technologies, Inc. is warned that "absent prompt appearance of substitute counsel, pleadings and papers may be stricken, and default judgment or other sanctions may be imposed against the entity." D.C.COLO.LAttyR 6.

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the deadline for Defendant Applied Technologies Inc. to file an Answer or other response to the Complaint [#1] is extended to **March 1, 2016**.

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the Answers [#15, #17] filed by pro se Defendants

Waldo R. Dagle and Herbert A. Zimmerman are **STRICKEN**. Neither document is signed, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(a), which provides that “[e]very pleading, written motion, and other paper must be signed . . . by a party personally if the party is unrepresented.” Rule 11(a) further provides that “[t]he court must strike an unsigned paper unless the omission is promptly corrected after being called to the . . . party’s attention.” As noted above, although Plaintiff brought this issue to Defendants’ attention with the filing of the Motion [#19], see *Certificate of Service* [#19] at 4, Defendants filed no response.

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the deadline for Defendants Dagle and Zimmerman to file an Answer or other response to the Complaint [#1] is extended to **March 1, 2016**.

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the Scheduling Conference set for January 19, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. is **VACATED** and **RESET** to April 19, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. in Courtroom A-401, Fourth Floor, Alfred A. Arraj United States Courthouse, 901 19th Street, Denver, Colorado.

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the parties shall submit their proposed scheduling order, pursuant to District of Colorado Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) Procedures. Deadline for submission of the proposed scheduling order is on or before April 12, 2016.

Defendants are hereby warned that failure to follow Court orders and/or failure to timely defend their case may result in sanctions.

Dated: January 12, 2016