

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 \*\*\*

4  
5 GILBERTO CARRILLO,

6 Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:12-cv-02165-JAD-VCF

7 vs.

**ORDER**

8 DOUGLAS GILLESPIE, *et al.*,

(*Ex Parte* Motion for Additional Copywork #79)

9 Defendants.

(*Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies Injunction #94)

10  
11 Before the Court are *pro se* Plaintiff Gilberto Carrillo’s *Ex Parte* Motion for Additional  
12 Copywork (#79)<sup>1</sup> and *Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies Injunction (#94).

13 Plaintiff, who is currently in the Nevada Department of Corrections, filed the present *Ex Parte*  
14 Motion for Additional Copywork requesting \$45.00 to make sufficient copies of documents for  
15 opposing counsel and the Court. (#79). He filed the present *Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies  
16 Injunction requesting legal supplies “necessary to accommodate the court and discovery requested by  
17 counsels of the defendants.” (#94).

18 *Ex parte* motions are filed with the Court but not served upon the opposing party. LR7-5(a).  
19 Pursuant to Local Rule 7-5(b), “[a]ll *ex parte* motions, applications or requests shall contain a statement  
20 showing good cause why the matter was submitted to the Court without notice to all parties.” Motions  
21 may be submitted *ex parte* “only for compelling reasons.” LR 7-5(c). Defendant has not provided the  
22 court with a statement in either motion demonstrating “compelling reasons” why the motions were filed  
23

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> Refers to the Court’s docket number.

1 *ex parte*. Absent a LR7-5(b) statement, the Court will not consider these motions on an *ex parte* basis.  
2 Thus, the Court denies both motions *without prejudice*.

3 The Court recognizes that Plaintiff is *pro se* and thus should be held to less stringent standards  
4 than attorneys, *see Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21  
5 (1972) (*per curiam*), but the Court will not deny opposing counsel the opportunity to respond to a  
6 motion when a party does not provide “compelling reasons” for denying that opportunity.

7 Accordingly, and for good cause shown,

8 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff Gilberto Carrillo’s *Ex Parte* Motion for Additional Copywork  
9 (#79) and *Ex Parte* Motion for Legal Supplies Injunction (#94) be DENIED *without prejudice*.

10 DATED this 30th day of October, 2013.

11  
12 

13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 CAM FERENBACH  
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25