

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
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SHAFQAAT BUKHARI,
Plaintiff,
vs.
LENDING 1ST MORTGAGE, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-cv-00823-GMN-GWF
ORDER
Motion to Strike (#29)

This matter is before the Court on the Motion of EMC Mortgage Corporation, Chase Home Finance LLC, and Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. to Strike Plaintiff’s Opposition to Defendants’ Answer to Complaint (#29), filed September 20, 2010.

Defendants request that the Court strike Plaintiff’s Opposition to Defendants’ Answer (#27), as an impermissible pleading. (#29). A response to a defendant’s answer is not a recognized pleading under Fed.R.Civ.P. 7. As a result, the Court finds good cause to strike Plaintiff’s response.


In addition, Plaintiff failed to respond to the present motion and the time for opposition has now passed. LR 7-2(d) states in pertinent part, that “[t]he failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of the motion.” For the reasons discussed above, the Court will grant the present motion. Accordingly,

...
...
...
...
...

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
27
28

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Answer to Complaint (#29) is **granted**. The Clerk of the Court shall strike Plaintiff's "Opposition to Defendants' Answer to Complaint" from the record.

DATED this 11th day of January, 2011.



GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
United States Magistrate Judge