




1 Nos. 8, 12), those documents may be filed as attachments to a notice of compliance. The pending  
2 motion to dismiss and stipulation must be re-filed as standalone docket entries.<sup>1</sup>

3 The Court further **ORDERS** the parties to familiarize themselves with Rule 5.2 and Special  
4 Order No. 108, and to fully comply with them in the future. The Court expects strict compliance with  
5 the orders and rules of the Court, and the parties and counsel should be aware that the failure to comply  
6 may result in sanctions. *See, e.g., Davis v. Clark County Sch. Dist.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 128937, \*5  
7 n.3 (D. Nev. Sept. 9, 2013) (sanctioning counsel for repeated failure to comply with Court orders,  
8 including order to use only minor's initials in filings).<sup>2</sup>

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: November 20, 2015

11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 NANCY J. KOPPE  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 <sup>1</sup> Nothing herein shall be construed as altering the briefing schedule on the motion to dismiss. In  
24 particular, in the event that the re-filing of that motion triggers the issuance of an automatic notice of a  
25 response deadline through CM/ECF, counsel is instructed that the automatically noticed deadline is not  
controlling. *Cf. Carrillo v. B&J Andrews Enters., LLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 22010, \*2 (D. Nev. Feb. 19,  
2013).

26 <sup>2</sup> The Court has previously cautioned one of the attorneys improperly filing documents in this case  
27 on the very same issue. *See J.D.H. v. Las Vegas Metro. Police Dept.*, 2:13-cv-1300-APG-NJK, Docket No.  
28 51 (August 14, 2014) (“Mr. Anderson and Mr. Hanseen are further **CAUTIONED** that they should expect  
future non-compliance with the Court’s redaction requirements to result in monetary sanctions.”).