

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 JOSE HERNANDEZ,

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 INDYMAC BANK, et al.,

14 Defendants.
15

Case No. 2:12-cv-00369-MMD-CWH

ORDER

16 Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Jose Hernandez's Ex Parte Request to Modify Order
17 on Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Expert Report (ECF No. 142), filed on January 22,
18 2016. Plaintiff requests that the Court modify the expert disclosure deadline and that the Court
19 limit Defendants' request for attorney's fees.

20 Local Rule 7-5(b) provides that "[a]ll ex parte motions, applications or requests shall
21 contain a statement showing good cause why the matter was submitted to the Court without notice
22 to all parties." Local Rule 7-5(c) further provides that "[m]otions, applications or requests may be
23 submitted ex parte only for compelling reasons" The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's motion
24 and finds that Plaintiff does not demonstrate good cause or compelling reasons why the motion was
25 submitted to the court without notice to all parties. The Court therefore declines to consider this
26 motion on an ex parte basis and will enter an order on the motion after Defendants' response
27 deadline and Plaintiff's reply deadline have expired.

28 ///

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Clerk of Court must unseal Plaintiff Jose Hernandez's
2 Ex Parte Request to Modify Order on Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Expert Report (ECF
3 No. 142).

4
5 DATED: February 1, 2016

6
7 
8 C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28