UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SOFIA A. WILLIAMS, Plaintiff,	)	Case No. 2:11-cv-02112-KJD-CWH
vs.	)	**ORDER**
GOLD COAST HOTEL AND CASINO, et al., Defendants.	)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Amendment of Document Names (#66), filed May 16, 2012.

Plaintiff is proceeding in this matter *pro se* and is not familiar with filing practices. She requests that the Court amend the caption of several filings so that they are properly identified on the docket. The Court has reviewed the docket and agrees that, in the interest of clarity, the following filings need to be addressed:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (#38), filed March 19, 2012, is a reply to Defendants' responses to Plaintiff's motion (#16), and
2. Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (#37), filed March 19, 2012, is a reply to Defendant United States Motion to Dismiss (#20).

The Clerk of Court is instructed to terminate Plaintiff's motions (#37) and (#38) and identify each as a reply to the appropriate pending motions. As a result of this action, Defendants' Motion to Strike (#48), filed March 29, 2012, and Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (#54), filed April 13, 2012, are moot.

Dockets.Justia.com

Additionally, Plaintiff's incorrectly captioned Motion to Dismiss (#47) is a surreply. Normally, a litigant must request leave to file a surreply. Nevertheless, because Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* the Court must construe her pleadings liberally. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the Court will not strike improper surreply but will afford it the weight it deserves, if any, in consideration of the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (#12).

Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Amendment of Document Names (#66) is **granted**. The Clerk of Court is instructed to identify Plaintiff's motions (#37) and (#38) as replies to the appropriate pending motions.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Strike (#48) and Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (#54) are **denied as moot**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court identify Plaintiff's incorrectly captioned Motion to Dismiss (#47) as a surreply to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (#12).

Dated this 21st day of May, 2012.

C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge