

1 Tagle's "answer" and "affidavit" are not proper filings permitted under the Federal Rules of Civil
2 Procedure or Local Rules, such as a complaint, motion, response, or reply. These documents serve no
3 purpose in the case, and therefore ECF Nos. 57 and 59 shall be stricken.

4 The Court must also caution Tagle regarding Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(b): "By
5 presenting to the court a pleading, written motion, or other paper...an attorney or unrepresented party
6 certifies that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief...it is not being presented for
7 any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of
8 litigation." "If, after notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond, the court determines that Rule 11(b)
9 has been violated, the court may impose an appropriate sanction." Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c). The Court is not
10 contemplating sanctions at this time. However, should Tagle continue to file fugitive documents that
11 appear to be presented solely to harass Defense counsel and other individuals, the Court may consider
12 sanctions in the future.

13 Accordingly,

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' motions to strike (ECF Nos. 58, 60) are
15 GRANTED. ECF Nos. 57 and 59 are hereby stricken.

16
17 **NOTICE**

18 Pursuant to Local Rules IB 3-1 and IB 3-2, a party may object to orders and reports and
19 recommendations issued by the magistrate judge. Objections must be in writing and filed with the Clerk
20 of the Court within fourteen days. LR IB 3-1, 3-2. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal
21 may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified
22 time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections
23 within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the
24 right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court.

1 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452,
2 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

3 Pursuant to LR IA 3-1, the Plaintiff must immediately file written notification with the court of
4 any change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party of the
5 party's attorney. **Failure to comply with this Rule may result in dismissal of the action.**

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED this 26th day of March, 2019.



8
9 CAM FERENBACH
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE