

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

* * *

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff(s),</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC, et al., <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant(s).</p>	Case No. 2:15-CV-1768 JCM (CWH) <p style="text-align: center;">ORDER</p>
---	---

Presently before the court is the matter of Bank of America, N.A. v. SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC, et al., case number 2:15-cv-01768-JCM-CWH.

On June 5, 2017, the court granted the parties motion to extend time (ECF No. 98) and extended the proposed joint pretrial order deadline to June 30, 2017. (ECF No. 99).

On June 30, 2017, third-party plaintiff Thomas Jessup LLC (“Jessup”) and third-party defendant Daushari Wong-Culotta (“Wong”) submitted a proposed pretrial order (ECF No. 105), which did not include all of the parties in this action—i.e., Bank of America, N.A. (“BANA”), SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC (“SFR”), and Davyn Ridge Homeowners Association (the “HOA”). While BANA and Jessup have stipulated to the dismissal of BANA’s claims against Jessup (ECF Nos. 101, 108), such stipulation does not resolve BANA’s claims against SFR and the HOA or SFR’s counterclaim against BANA. Therefore, the parties have failed to timely comply with the court’s order or request an extension as to the joint pretrial order deadline.

In light of the foregoing, the court hereby strikes Jessup’s and Wong’s proposed pretrial order (ECF No. 105), as well as the pretrial order (ECF No. 106), as the pretrial order did not comply with the applicable local and federal rules—specifically, the pretrial order did not include all of the parties to the present action. See, e.g., Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc., 627 F.3d

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

402, 404 (9th Cir. 2010) (holding that district courts have inherent power to control their own dockets); see also LR IC 7-1 (“The court may strike documents that do not comply with these rules.”). The parties shall file—on or before **Friday, July 21, 2017**—a proposed joint pretrial order, which includes all of the parties and claims and complies with the applicable local and federal rules, including LR 16-3 and LR 16-4. Failure to timely comply may result in appropriate sanctions.

Accordingly,
IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED July 11, 2017.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE