

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**

ROBERT JOSEPH MCCARTY,)
)
Plaintiff(s),)
)
vs.)
)
JOHN V. ROOS, et al.,)
)
Defendant(s).)
_____)

Case No. 2:11-cv-01538-JCM-NJK
**ORDER REQUIRING FILING OF
AMENDED RESPONSE TO MOTION
TO DISMISS THAT COMPLIES
WITH THE LOCAL RULES**

On April 23, 2013, the Court struck Plaintiff's response to the pending motion to dismiss and ordered that he file a new response in compliance with the Local Rules no later than May 6, 2013. Docket No. 148. The Court has now received a notice that Plaintiff does not believe he is able to limit his response to the page limit outlined in the Local Rules. *See* Docket No. 150. *Pro se* litigants are required to follow the rules of this Court. *See Carter v. C.I.R.*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986). Plaintiff here has failed to show that an exception should be made to the page limitation and formatting requirements of Local Rules 7-4 and 10-1. As such, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff, no later than May 13, 2013, to submit a response to the motion to dismiss that complies with the Local Rules, including that it be limited to no more than 30 pages of double-spaced text.

Plaintiff is advised that failure to file a proper response to the motion to dismiss may be considered by the district judge as Plaintiff consenting to the granting of the motion to dismiss. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d).

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: April 30, 2013

NANCY L. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge