

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**

IPFS CORPORATION,)
)
 Plaintiff(s),)
)
 vs.)
)
 LORRAINE CARRILLO,)
)
 Defendant(s).)
 _____)

Case No. 2:14-cv-00509-GMN-NJK
ORDER
(Docket No. 83)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s renewed motion to reopen discovery. Docket No. 76. Defendant filed a response, along with a counter-motion to exclude. Docket Nos. 81, 82. Plaintiff filed a reply. Docket No. 83. Plaintiff’s reply asserts that the time-frame for filing the reply did not allow it sufficient time to address all issues raised in Defendant’s response and counter-motion. *See id.* at 3.¹ The reply brief purports to incorporate by reference the arguments raised in Plaintiff’s forthcoming response to the counter-motion. *See id.*

The Court hereby **STRIKES** the reply brief (Docket No. 83). No later than July 10, 2015, Plaintiff shall file a reply to the motion to reopen discovery and a response to the counter-motion.

¹ The reply brief was due on July 6, 2015 pursuant to the parties’ stipulation. *See* Docket No. 80.

1 Plaintiff is not permitted to incorporate by reference arguments made elsewhere. Defendant's reply to
2 her counter-motion shall be filed no later than July 15, 2015.²

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: July 7, 2015

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

27 _____
28 ² If either or both parties believe a briefing schedule set by the Court does not provide sufficient time to prepare their briefs, the proper means for seeking relief is to file a request with the Court for an extension.