Aiken v. Snee et al Doc. 17

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

PATRICIA AIKEN,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

THOMAS M. SNEE, et al.,

Defendant(s).

2:13-CV-1768 JCM (VCF)

## **ORDER**

Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Patricia Aiken's motion for summary judgment. (Doc. # 2). *Pro se* defendant Thomas M. Snee filed a response in opposition (doc. # 10), and plaintiff filed a reply (doc. # 14).

The instant motion consists of nothing more than a cover page followed by sixty-seven pages of attached documents relating to a dispute over employment compensation between plaintiff and defendant Snee. (Doc. # 2). Plaintiff has not filed a complaint in this matter.

As there has been no complaint filed, the court is unable to grant summary judgment. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 3 ("A civil action is commenced by filing a complaint with the court."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 ("A party may move for summary judgment, *identifying each claim or defense* — or the part of each claim or defense — on which summary judgment is sought.") (emphasis added).

Because plaintiff has not filed a complaint and therefore the court cannot identify any cognizable claims upon which she may be entitled to summary judgment, the instant motion will be denied.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (doc. # 2) be, and at the same time hereby is, DENIED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for expedited consideration of summary judgment (doc. # 16) is DENIED as moot. DATED April 2, 2014. 

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge