

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 16-cv-00446-MEH

TRAVIS HODSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY KROLL,
MATTHEW ELBE,
BRANDON WILLIAMS,
ROBYN JUBA,
STEVE REAMS,
UNKNOWN DEPUTY (A), and
UNKNOWN DEPUTIES,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on March 20, 2017.

Plaintiff's Motion [for] More Definite Statement Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e) [filed March 17, 2017; ECF No. 45] is **denied** for the following reasons.

First, Rule 12(e) provides that “[a] party may move for a more definite statement of a *pleading . . .*” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e) (emphasis added). Here, Plaintiff seeks a more definite statement from the Defendants concerning the pending motion to dismiss. However, a motion is not a pleading and, thus, Rule 12(e) does not apply. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 7.

Second, even if Rule 12(e) applied, the Plaintiff provides no explanation nor other information as to what in the motion he does not understand or that which he believes requires clarification.

Third, the proceedings of this case, including briefing on the motion to dismiss, are currently stayed pending the Status Conference next month.