Lout v. Jovanovich et al Doc. 67

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA HELENA DIVISION

JEFFERY J. LOUT,

CV 15-00055-H-DLC-JTJ

Plaintiff,

VS.

**ORDER** 

ROXANNE TUSS, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Jeffery Lout, a prisoner proceeding in forma pauperis and without counsel, has filed a Motion to Waive Local Rule 7.1(c). (Doc. 66.) This is Mr. Lout's second request to waive Local Rule 7.1. *See* Doc. 34. On May 27, 2016, the Court specifically denied this request and indicated that "[t]he parties must comply with Local Rule 7.1 prior to filing any motion or the motion will be subject to summary denial." (Doc. 40 at 10.)

Despite this ruling Mr. Lout again requests that the Court waive the requirement that when filing a motion, "[t]he text of the motion must state that other parties have been contacted and state whether any party objects to the motion." L.R. 7.1(c). Mr. Lout contends that because he is incarcerated he does not have access to a telephone and counsel for Defendants refuses to answer his correspondence. Whether or not counsel respond to Mr. Lout's correspondence,

does not excuse this requirement. Mr. Lout is still required to write counsel and

ask whether they object to any motion he intends to file. If counsel does not

respond within a week of mailing the letter, Mr. Lout may file his motion. The

Court will not order the prison to allow Mr. Lout to use the phone for this purpose

and it will not waive this requirement.

Should Mr. Lout continue to file motions on issues which have already been

addressed by the Court without complying with Local Rule 7.3 regarding motions

for reconsideration, the Court will consider sanctions.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Mr. Lout's Motion to Waive

Local Rule 7.1(c) (Doc. 66) is **DENIED**.

DATED this 5th day of October 2016.

/s/ John Johnston

John Johnston

United States Magistrate Judge

2