

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**

MEDERICK LEE, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	Case No. 2:14-cv-00328-JCM-CWH
)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER OF)	
SOUTHERN NEVADA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Discovery (doc. # 68) and Motion to Seal (doc. # 69), both filed November 20, 2015.

After careful review, the Court finds that Plaintiffs’ motion to compel must be denied for failure to comply with Local Rules 26-7(a) and (b). Local Rule 26-7(a) requires a discovery motion to “set forth in full the text of the discovery originally sought and the response thereto, if any.” Loc.Civ.R. 26-7(a). However, Plaintiffs fail to provide the complete text of requests and specific discovery responses in the body of the motion. Plaintiffs also do not bother to link their arguments to the complete text of requests and to the discovery responses. Instead, Plaintiffs have simply attached the requests and discovery responses as exhibits, which fails to comply with this Court’s rules.

Moreover, Local Rule 26-7(b) requires the movant to attach a statement “certifying that, after personal consultation and sincere effort to do so, the parties have been unable to resolve the matter without Court action.” Loc.Civ.R. 26-7(b). Plaintiffs have not described the efforts made to resolve each discovery dispute. Given Plaintiffs’ failures, the Court denies the motion to compel (doc. # 68) without prejudice, and denies the motion to seal (doc. # 69) as moot.

1 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery (doc.
2 # 68) is **denied without prejudice**.

3 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Motion to Seal (doc. # 69) is **denied as moot**.

4 DATED: November 24, 2015

5
6
7 
8 _____
9 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**
10 **United States Magistrate Judge**