

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 IRIS JANE GROSS,

7 Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:11-cv-01602-JCM-CWH

8 vs.

**ORDER**

9 HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CITY  
10 LAS VEGAS, *et al.*,

11 Defendants.

12  
13 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (#167), filed October 20,  
14 2014.

15 This matter has been aggressively litigated by both parties, and the Court is mindful that  
16 Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. While courts broadly construe pleadings filed by *pro se* litigants,  
17 even *pro se* litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *King v. Atiyeh*, 814  
18 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987). *Pro se* litigants are not treated more favorably than parties with  
19 attorneys of record and are expected to abide by the rules of court in which the litigation proceeds.  
20 *Carter v. Comm’r of Internal Revenue*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986).

21 Plaintiff’s motion to compel (#167) does not comply with Local Rule 26-7(a), which  
22 requires “[a]ll motions to compel discovery or for protective order shall set forth in full the text of  
23 the discovery originally sought and the response thereto, if any.” Plaintiff sets forth in her motion  
24 several discovery requests to which she believes the responses were either improper or inadequate.  
25 In so doing, Plaintiff determined not to provide the “full text” of the responses to which she  
26 complains – choosing instead to summarize the responses. The reason the Court requires the “full  
27 text” of a response is obvious – it is necessary to adequately understand and address the entirety of  
28 the dispute and prevents piecemeal presentation. It also prevents a moving party from  
misrepresenting responses in order to bolster a motion. The failure of Plaintiff to provide the “full


1 text” of Defendants’ responses renders the motion incomplete and noncompliant with Court rules.

2 Even though Plaintiff failed to set forth the “full text” of the responses she claims are  
3 inadequate within the body of the motion, the undersigned has conducted a review of the exhibits  
4 attached to the motion – none of which contain the full text of either the discovery requests or  
5 discovery responses. Consequently, the motion does not comply with Local Rule 26-7(a). The  
6 Court will not consider a motion to compel challenging discovery responses without having benefit  
7 of the full text of the responses in question.

8 Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing,

9 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (#167) is **denied**.

10 Dated: November 13, 2014.

11  
12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 C.W. Hoffman, Jr.  
15 United States Magistrate Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28