

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

GARY LAMONT ABRAHAM,)
)
 Plaintiff,) 8:11CV302
)
 v.)
)
 DOUGLAS COUNTY,) MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
)
 Defendant.)
)

This matter is before the Court on the parties' numerous Objections and "Objections to Objections." (Filing Nos. [53](#), [54](#), [60](#), [61](#), and [63](#).) Also pending are plaintiff's "Motion for Hearing and Fair Trial" and "Motion to Suspend or Hold in Abeyance All Proceedings." (Filing Nos. [57](#) and [59](#).) Upon careful consideration,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Court construes plaintiff's December 6, 2012, Objection (Filing No. [53](#)) as a response to defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.

2. The clerk's office is directed to update the docket sheet to reflect that Filing Number 53 is a response to defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.

3. For the reasons explained to plaintiff in the Court's November 27, 2012, Memorandum and Order, plaintiff's "Motion for Hearing and Fair Trial" (Filing No. 57) is denied.

4. Plaintiff's "Motion to Suspend or Hold in Abeyance All Proceedings" (Filing No. [59](#)), "Objections to Defendant Proposed Final Pretrial [sic] Order" (Filing No. [60](#)), and "2nd Objection to Defendant Objection" (Filing No. [63](#)) are granted only to the extent that the final pretrial conference in this matter, currently scheduled for March 14, 2013, is cancelled. The conference may be rescheduled after the resolution of defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.

5. The clerk's office is directed to cancel the final pretrial conference in this matter, currently scheduled for March 14, 2013.

6. Defendant's Objections to plaintiff's Objections (Filing Nos. [54](#) and [61](#)) are denied.

DATED this 20th day of February, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lyle E. Strom

LYLE E. STROM, Senior Judge
United States District Court

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the Court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The Court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the Court.