

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HAROLD D. HARDEN,
Plaintiff,
vs.
SOBORO, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:14-cv-00560-JAD-NJK

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

(Docket No. 64)

On January 5, 2015, the Court denied Plaintiff’s motion to file discovery. Docket No. 62. The Court instructed Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding in this action *pro se*, that parties should not file discovery documents with the Court but should instead “serve the discovery directly on Defendants’ counsel.” *See* Docket No. 62 (discussing Local Rule 26-8). Now pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration of that order. Docket No. 64. Defendants have filed a response indicating that they have agreed to respond to discovery even though it has not been served on them. *See* Docket No. 66.

The Court reiterates that parties do not file discovery documents. When a party seeks to get discovery from the opposing party, he serves that discovery directly on the opposing party’s attorney. There is no requirement to file discovery with the Court in order for the discovery to be effective and to get a response. In this case, Defendants’ counsel has indicated that she stipulated to the discovery at

1 issue being deemed served as of December 23, 2014. *See* Docket No. 66. As such, there appears to be
2 no need to ask this Court for relief and the motion for reconsideration is **DENIED** as moot.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: January 20, 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