

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ALAN PULSIPHER,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
CLARK COUNTY et al.,)
)
Defendants.)
_____)

2:08-cv-01374-RCJ-LRL

ORDER

This case arises out of alleged race-, religion-, and gender-based employment discrimination. A jury returned a verdict for Defendants. Plaintiff moved for a new trial, and Defendants moved to amend the judgment and for attorney’s fees and costs. The Court denied the motions, except that it amended the judgment to permit costs to Defendants. Because the Court did not address the question in the order denying a new trial, Defendants have now moved for the Court to clarify whether Plaintiff’s motion was timely. It was not. A motion for new trial must be made within twenty-eight (28) days after judgment. The Court entered judgment on February 25, 2011, and the twenty-eighth day thereafter was Friday, March 25, 2011. March 25, 2011 was not a holiday. Plaintiff filed his motion for a new trial on Monday, March 28, 2011. The motion was therefore untimely.


///
///

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 144) is
3 GRANTED.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated this 6th day of June, 2011.

6 
7 _____
8 ROBERT C. JONES
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25