

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**

ROY BELL,)	
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	Case No. 2:14-cv-00476-RFB-NJK
)	
vs.)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART
)	MOTION TO EXTEND
THE STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,)	
)	(Docket No. 27)
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is Defendants’ motion to extend the deadline to respond to the complaint. Docket No. 27. Defendants acknowledge the Court’s clear order that the response to the complaint was due no later than October 6, 2014 for any Defendants on whose behalf the Attorney General accepted service. *See id.* at 2; *see also* Docket No. 17 at 2. Nonetheless, Defendants argue that there was a docketing error in that a later date was automatically generated by CM/ECF. *See* Docket No. 27 at 2. Defendants’ motion seeks an extension to the later, CM/ECF-generated deadline. *See id.*

It is well settled that an automatically-generated CM/ECF notice does not constitute an order of the Court. *See, e.g., Carrillo v. B&J Andrews Enters., LLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist Lexis. 22010, *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 19, 2013). When such a notice conflicts with a Court order, parties are required to comply with the Court order. *Id.* Accordingly, there should have been no confusion that Defendants’ deadline to respond to the complaint remained October 6, 2014.

//
//

1 The Court expects Defendants' counsel to strictly comply with all Court orders. Nonetheless,
2 in this one instance, the Court will grant in part the motion for an extension to October 14, 2014.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: October 7, 2014

5
6 
7 _____
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28