UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA RONALD NEAL JOSEPH, SR., et al. Plaintiffs, 2:09-cv-00966-HDM-LRL VS. ORDER LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE) DEPARTMENT, et al.

Defendants.

On July 22, 2011, plaintiffs filed a motion for telephonic hearing (Docket No. 114) on defendants' motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 73). On July 25, 2011, defendants filed a motion to strike (Docket No. 115) plaintiffs' motion for telephonic hearing (Docket No. 114) on defendants' motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 73). Plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing (Docket No. 114) is ripe.

Plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing (Docket No. 114)

is essentially a "sur-reply" to defendants' motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 73). The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7-2 govern the filing of dispositive motions and responsive pleadings. Local Rule 7-2 allows the filing of a motion, a response by the opposing party and a reply by the moving party. Sur-replies are not permitted without leave of the court. See Sattari v. CitiMortgage, 2011 WL 1103403, *2 (D.Nev. March 23, 2011) (citing Garrison v. Northeast Ga. Med. Ctr., Inc., 66 F. Supp. 2d 1336, 1340 (N.D.Ga. 1999)). Based on the foregoing, defendants request that the court strike the legal arguments set forth in plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing. (See Docket No. 115)

The court hereby GRANTS defendants' motion to strike (Docket No. 115) the legal arguments set forth in plaintiffs' motion for a telephonic hearing (Docket No. 114) which relate to the motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 73).

The court GRANTS that portion of plaintiffs' motion (Docket No. 114) requesting a telephonic hearing on the motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 73) and schedules a telephonic hearing on the motion (Docket No. 73) on August 11, 2011, at 10:00 a.m.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 26th day of July, 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Abward DMEKiller