

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MARC J. RANDAZZA, an individual, )  
 JENNIFER RANDAZZA, an individual, and )  
 NATALIA RANDAZZA, a minor, )  
 )  
 Plaintiffs, )  
 vs. )  
 )  
 CRYSTAL L. COX, an individual, and ELIOT )  
 BERNSTEIN, an individual, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

Case No.: 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL

**ORDER**

This case involves allegations of trademark infringement and cybersquatting resulting from the registration of certain domain names by Defendant Crystal Cox and Defendant Eliot Bernstein. Pending before the Court is the Motion to Extend Time (ECF No. 26) and the Motion to Allow Exhibits Attached to the Complaint/Answer (ECF No. 42), both of which were filed by pro se Defendant Crystal Cox (“Defendant”).

**I. DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE EXHIBITS IN COMPLAINT ANSWER AND COUNTER COMPLAINT (ECF No. 26)**

In her motion, Defendant states that she “is mailing her Answer to the Complaint, Counter Claim, Motion to Recuse, Motion to Investigate, Motion Requesting Preservation of Evidence . . . and requests an extension due to holidays and mail issues for adding Exhibits to this Case Electronically.” (Mot. 1, ECF No. 26.)

This request relates to the timeliness of filing her original Answer, (see ECF No. 23), and is MOOT because Defendant’s original Answer is no longer the governing answer in this case. Specifically, in the Court’s February 22, 2013 Order, the Court permitted Defendant to

1 file an Amended Answer. (See ECF No. 89.) In response, Defendant filed her Amended  
2 Answer on February 23, 2013. (ECF No. 90.) Accordingly, Defendant's request to extend time  
3 attach exhibits to her original Answer is **MOOT**.

4 **II. DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO ALLOW EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO**  
5 **COMPLAINT ANSWER (ECF No. 42)**

6 In her motion, Defendant requests that the Court "accept Exhibits to Defendant Crystal  
7 Cox's Complaint answer (Document 23), as Pro Se Defendant Crystal Cox does not have the  
8 money to print and mail the large amount of exhibits named in the complaint answer regarding  
9 Case 2:12-cv-02040-GMN-PAL." (Mot. 1, ECF No. 43.)

10 This request also relates to Defendant's original Answer. (See ECF No. 23.) However,  
11 as discussed above, Defendant's original Answer is no longer the governing answer in this  
12 case. Specifically, in the Court's February 22, 2013 Order, the Court permitted Defendant to  
13 file an Amended Answer. (See ECF No. 89.) In response, Defendant filed her Amended  
14 Answer on February 23, 2013. (ECF No. 90.) Accordingly, Defendant's request to attach  
15 exhibits to her original Answer is **MOOT**.

16 **III. CONCLUSION**

17 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Extend Time to File Exhibits  
18 in Complaint Answer and Counter Complaint (ECF No. 26) is DENIED as MOOT.

19 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Allow Exhibits Attached to  
20 Complaint Answer (ECF No. 42) is DENIED as MOOT.

21 **DATED** this 12th day of July, 2013.

22  
23  
24  
25  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gloria M. Navarro  
United States District Judge