

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\*\*\*

J. MICHAEL SCHAEFER,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
STEPHEN HUNDLEY,  
Defendant.

2:15-cv-02017-RFB-VCF  
**ORDER**

Before the court is Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Motion to Strike 10/16/17 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No. 50). Since this motion is filed as ex-parte, Defendant received no notification of the filing of instant motion through CM/ECF. Schaefer has not provided the court with any reason to grant the relief on an ex parte basis.

Pursuant to Local Rule IA 7-2(b), neither party nor an attorney for any party may make an ex parte communication with the court except as specifically permitted by the local rules or the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Here, Schaefer has not given good cause or any compelling reason why the instant motion was submitted to the Court without notice to defendant.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that any opposition to Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Motion to Strike 10/16/17 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No. 50) must be filed on or before November 28, 2017. The reply in support of Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Motion to Strike 10/16/17 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No. 50) is due December 5, 2017.

1 The Clerk of Court is directed to remove the ex parte status on Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Strike  
2 10/16/17 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No. 50).

3 DATED this 14th day of November, 2017.  
4

5 

6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 CAM FERENBACH  
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25