

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

* * *

JEREMY R. BEASLEY, et al.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AAA NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, NEVADA,
UTAH,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01788-MMD-VCF

ORDER


(Motion to Amend Complaint – dkt. no. 15)

Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Amend/Correct the Complaint on January 7, 2013. (Dkt. no. 15.) In accordance with Local Rule 15-1(a), Plaintiffs attached the proposed Amended Complaint to their Motion. (*Id.*) The deadline to file a response to the Motion was January 24, 2013. (Dkt. no. 15.) Defendant did not file a response to the Motion.

Failure to file points and authorities in opposition to a motion constitutes consent that the motion be granted. L.R. 7-2(d); *see Abbott v. United Venture Capital, Inc.*, 718 F. Supp. 828, 831 (D. Nev. 1989). The Court therefore GRANTS Plaintiffs’ unopposed Motion.

Though Plaintiffs included the proposed Amended Complaint in their Motion, the document is not a separately-filed entry, but part of the same document as the Motion. Plaintiffs are therefore ORDERED to file the Amended Complaint as a separate docket entry. The Complaint should be entitled “First Amended Complaint,” and Plaintiffs should delete any references to the Amended Complaint being a “proposed” document.

ENTERED THIS 14th day of February 2013.



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE