

1 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
Nevada Attorney General
2 DENISE S. McKAY
Deputy Attorney General
3 Nevada Bar No. 10507
JOHN L. WARD IV
4 Deputy Attorney General
Nevada Bar No. 12513
5 Bureau of Litigation
Public Safety Division
6 100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4717
7 Tel: (775) 684-1134
E-mail: jward@ag.nv.gov
8 *Attorneys for Defendants*
Romeo Aranas and Karen Gedney
9
10
11

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

14 FERENC FARKAS,
15 Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:14-cv-00451-JAD-VCF

16 vs.

**MOTION TO WITHDRAW DEFENDANTS'
EXPERT DISCLOSURE**

17 STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, as nominal Defendants;
18 DR. ARANAS; DR. KAREN GEDNEY; DOE
MEDICAL DOCTOR I, and DOE
19 DEFENDANTS I-X,

20 Defendants.

21 Defendants Romeo Aranas and Karen Gedney,¹ by and through counsel, Adam Paul
22 Laxalt, Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and John L. Ward IV, Deputy Attorney
23 General, hereby file their *Motion to Withdraw Defendants' Expert Disclosure*. This *Motion* is

24
25 ¹ According to Plaintiff's superseding *First Amended Complaint* (Doc. #59), Plaintiff is no longer pursuing
any legal claim against the State of Nevada, *ex rel.* Nevada Department of Corrections ("NDOC"). *Cf.* Doc. #53
26 at 1:26 – 2:1 (Plaintiff's opposition [. . .] stipulates to the dismissal of the State and NDOC [. . . and] does not
disagree that Drs. Aranas and Gedney must be dismissed from the federal claims for monetary and declaratory
27 relief, but also states a desire to amend his complaint to name them in their personal capacities so he can pursue
money damages from them."). *Compare* Doc. #59 at 2:17 – 3:10 (Plaintiff did not name State of Nevada, *ex rel.*
28 NDOC as a party-defendant in his superseding *First Amended Complaint* (Doc. #59)) *with* Doc. #1 at 3:9-12
(Plaintiff named State of Nevada, *ex rel.* NDOC as a party-defendant in Plaintiff's now superseded *Complaint*
(Doc. #1)). Notwithstanding, the caption to this case still inappropriately lists "State of Nevada Department of
Corrections, as nominal Defendants."

1 based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, any oral argument this Court
2 may entertain on the same, and all other papers and pleadings filed in this action.

3 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

4 **I. RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

5 On August 10, 2015, in error, Defendants filed their *Expert Disclosure* (Doc. #65). As a
6 discovery document, this *Expert Disclosure* (#65) was not subject to filing, but rather to
7 mailing (as between the Parties). See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.

8 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

9 It has long been understood that certain implied powers must
10 necessarily result to our Courts of justice from the nature of their
11 institution, powers which cannot be dispensed with in a Court,
12 because they are necessary to the exercise of all others[. . .]
13 These powers are governed not by rule or statute but by the
14 control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so
15 as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.

16 *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 43 (1991) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

17 **III. ARGUMENT**

18 Defendants move to withdraw their *Expert Disclosure* (Doc. #65) from the docket, or to
19 strike² the same, as this Court sees fit, for the inherent error of filing a discovery document not
20 relevant to a motion to compel, etc.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///


² A district court has the inherent power to strike a party's submissions other than pleadings. See *Metzger v. Hussman*, 682 F.Supp. 1109, 1110 (D.Nev. 1988). The alternative basis for striking improper filings is the district court's "inherent power over the administration of its business. It has inherent authority to regulate the conduct of attorneys [and parties] who appear before it [and] to promulgate and enforce rules for the management of litigation. [. . .]" *Spurlock v. F.B.I.*, 69 F.3d 1010, 1016 (9th Cir. 1995) (citations omitted).

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reason(s), Defendants request that this Court strike or otherwise
3 withdraw from the docket Defendants' *Expert Disclosure* (Doc. #65).

4 Dated: August 12, 2015.

5 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
6 Attorney General

7 By: 
8 JOHN L. WARD IV
9 Deputy Attorney General
10 Bureau of Litigation
11 Public Safety Division
12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

13
14 The Clerk of Court is directed to strike Docket # 6

15
16
17
18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19
20 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**
21 **DATED: _____**