

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION**

VANESSA SHAW,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 2:11-cv-481-FtM-99SPC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

_____ /

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the Plaintiff, Vanessa Shaw's Reply and Second Motion for Hearing (Doc. #20) filed on October 4, 2011. The Motion was referred to this Court by the District Court on March 6, 2012.

The Plaintiff filed a Reply Brief in Response to the Defendant, United States of America's Response (Doc. # 17) to her Motion for a Hearing and Objection. "No party shall file any reply or further memorandum directed to the motion or response . . . unless the Court grants leave." M.D. Fla. Local Rule 3.01(c). A motion requesting leave to file . . . a reply or further memorandum shall not exceed three (3) pages, shall specify the length of the proposed filing, and shall not include, as an attachment or otherwise, the proposed motion response, reply, or other paper. Torrence v. Pfizer, Inc., 2007 WL 788368, *1 (M.D.Fla. March 14, 2007) (citing M.D. Fla. Local Rule 3.01(d)). The purpose of a reply brief is to rebut any new law or facts contained in the oppositions response to a request for relief before the Court.

As noted above the M.D. Fla. Local Rules require a party to seek permission from the Court prior to filing a reply brief. In this instance, the Plaintiff did not seek the Court's permission prior

to filing her Reply. Therefore, the Plaintiff's Reply and Second Motion for a Hearing is due to be denied.

Accordingly, it is now

ORDERED:

The Plaintiff, Vanessa Shaw's Reply and Second Motion for Hearing (Doc. #20) is **DENIED**.

DONE AND ORDERED at Fort Myers, Florida, this 6th day of March, 2012.


SHERI POLSTER CHAPPELL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies: All Parties of Record