/. Smi	th Las Vegas II	Doc. 128	
1			
2			
3			
5			
6	UNITED STATES !	DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
8			
9	DEBRA JENE PATEL-JULSON,)	
10	Plaintiff,) Case No. 2:12-cv-01023-APG-CWH	
11	vs.	ORDER	
12	PAUL SMITH LAS VEGAS, INC,		
13	Defendant.		
14	This matter is before the Court on what has been designated as a Motion to Strike (#127), filed		
15	by Plaintiff on December 8, 2014. The filing is not a new motion, but a surreply associated with		
16	Plaintiff's pending motion to strike (#121), filed on	pending motion to strike (#121), filed on September 23, 2014.	
The Court recognizes that Plaintiff is proceeding <i>in</i>		ding in forma pauperis and is litigating the case pro	
	se, and has repeated acknowledged the need to broadly construe pleadings and other filings submitted by Plaintiff. Nevertheless, even pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. King v. Atiyeh, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir.1987); see also Jacobsen v. Filler, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364 (9th		
21			
Cir.1986) ("pro se litigants in the ordinary civil case should not be treated more favorable than partie with attorneys of record"); <i>Carter v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue</i> , 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir.1986) (pro se litigants expected to abide by the rules of the court in which litigation proceeds).		should not be treated more favorable than parties	
25	Local Rule 7-2 governs briefing and provides for a motion, response, and reply. Unless		
26	otherwise ordered by the Court, the rules do not permit surreplies. Courts in this district routinely		
27	interpret Local Rule 7-2 to permit the filing of a surreply only by leave of court "and only to address new		
28	matters raised in a reply to which the party would otherwise be unable to respond." <i>Kavnick v. City of</i>		
	Reno, 2008 WL 873085 (D. Nev.) (emphasis omitted). Surreplies are highly disfavored as they typically		

Patel

constitute an improper attempt by a party to have the last words on an issue. *Avery v. Barsky*, 2013 WL 1663612 (D. Nev.) (citation omitted). The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's submission (#127) and finds that it is an improper surreply and should be stricken. The parties arguments on Plaintiff's pending motion to strike (#121) have been set forth in prior briefing. The motion is currently under consideration and an order will issue shortly. Plaintiff's submission does not address new matters, but restates the same arguments already made. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion (#127) is **denied**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall **strike** the filing from the record.

DATED: December 10, 2014.

C.W. Hoffman, Jr.

United States Magistrate Judge