

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

* * *

ELIE HARFOUCHE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STARS ON TOUR, INC., et al.

Defendants.

2:13-cv-00615-LDG-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 117)

Pending before the Court is a letter that Plaintiff filed on the docket as an *ex parte* motion, despite the fact that Plaintiff states in the letter that it will be served on all parties via CM/ECF. Docket No. 117. This document contains numerous deficiencies.

As an initial matter, the Court addresses the term “*ex parte*.” The parties in this case have filed numerous documents, that they have served on each other, on the docket as *ex parte* documents. *See, e.g.*, Docket Nos. 78, 109, 110, 114. As United States District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey has succinctly surmised, “You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means.” *United Nat’l Ins. Co. v. Assurance Co. of Am. & Maryland Casualty Co.*, 2014 WL 4960915, *1 (D. Nev. June 4, 2014) (quoting Inigo Montoya from *The Princess Bride* (Act III Communications 1987)). An *ex parte* document is a document “that is filed with the Court, but is not served upon the opposing or other parties.” Local Rule 7-5(a). Further, “all *ex parte* motions, applications or requests shall contain a statement of good cause why the matter was submitted to the Court without notice to all parties.” Local Rule 7-5(b). Finally, “motions, applications or requests may be submitted *ex parte* only for compelling reasons...” Local Rule 7-5(c). The Court has previously denied a motion due to its improper *ex parte* filing, *see* Docket No. 79, and expects the parties to comply with all applicable rules regarding practice in this District.

