UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

PRISCELLA R. SAINTAL, Plaintiff, v. SHERYL FOSTER, et al., Defendants.	Case No. 2:11-cv-00445-MMD-PAL ORDER (Plf.'s Motion to Clarify for Appeal of Orders – dkt. no. 84)

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Clarify for Appeal of Orders. (Dkt. no. 84.) Plaintiff contends that the Court erroneously construed her previous motion, which she titled as "Plaintiff's Notice of Motion Objecting to Courts Ruling and/or Order" (dkt. no. 82) ("Objection") as a request for reconsideration. Plaintiff argues she was not seeking reconsideration. However, as the Court observed in addressing her Objection, Plaintiff failed to identify the procedural rule upon which she seeks relief but because Plaintiff argued that the Court committed clear error, her Objection was construed as a request for reconsideration (dkt. no. 83). By arguing that the Court made clear error, Plaintiff was essentially asking the Court to reconsider it earlier ruling. Plaintiff now argues that she was objecting pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 46 to preserve her rights to appeal. To the extent Plaintiff is concerned about preserving her appellate rights, Plaintiff retains her rights to appeal the Court's decisions in this case without having to file a formal written objection to the Court's rulings. It is therefore ordered that Plaintiff's Motion to Clarify is denied.

DATED THIS 4th day of March 2014.

MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE