

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
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

PH.D. JOY-CHARITY G. O’HALLORAN,
JOY-CHARITY GRACE O’HALLORAN,
PH.D. TRUST

2:09-CV-01851-PMP-LRL

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ORDER

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF THE
UNITED STATES

Defendants.

Before the Court for consideration is Plaintiffs’ Third and Final Motion for Default Summary Judgment (Doc. #18), filed on June 22, 2010. On July 6, 2010, Defendants’ filed their Response (Doc. #20) to which Plaintiffs’ Replied (Doc. #21) on July 22, 2010. Having read and considered the foregoing, the Court finds that Plaintiffs’ motion for default judgment (Doc. #18) must be denied.

The Court finds merit in Defendants’ response that Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment is incomprehensible and unintelligible. So too is Plaintiffs’ Complaint. Although pleadings prepared by *Pro Se* litigants are liberally construed, a *Pro Se* Plaintiff is not excused from stating a cognizable claim for relief. The Court can discern no genuine issues of material fact raised in Plaintiffs’ Complaint or identified by Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment.

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Third and Final Motion
2 for Default Summary Judgment (Doc. #18) is **DENIED**.

3
4 DATED: August 4, 2010.

5 

6 _____
7 PHILIP M. PRO
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26