1		
2		
3		
4 5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	DISTRIC	T OF NEVADA
10	DANIDEL LANE	
11	RANDEL LANE, Plaintiff,	Case No. 2:11-cv-00485-JCM-NJK
12	VS.	ORDER
13	CLARK COUNTY,) (Docket No. 72)
14	Defendant.	
15		
16		Motion for Kirk T. Kennedy to Answer Interrogatories.
17 18	Docket No. 72. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is DENIED . Plaintiff asks the Court to order his former attorney in the instant case to answer 23 separate	
19	interrogatories. <i>Id.</i> at 2-3. His former attorney is not a party to this case. Plaintiff submits no authority	
20	as to how the Court can order an attorney to respond to interrogatories when he represented the Plaintiff,	
21	but is not a party to the case.	
22	In any event, discovery in the instant case has been closed since February 2, 2012, and the case	
23	itself has been closed in this Court since February 13, 2013. Docket No. 21 at 2; Docket No. 40.	
24	Plaintiff cannot move to compel discovery responses more than four years after the close of discovery,	
25	and more than three years after the case itself w	vas closed. ¹
26		
27	¹ Even if the Court considered Plaintiff's 1	motion as a motion to compel discovery, it is procedurally
28	incorrect, and would be denied on that basis. <i>Se</i>	e Docket No. 70 at 1-2.
J	,i	

Lane v. Clark County

Doc. 74

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

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Plaintiff's motion, Docket No. 72, is hereby **DENIED**. IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 17, 2016.

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge