

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**

ARISTIDE NOUCHET,)	
)	Case No. 2:16-cv-00712-GMN-CWH
Plaintiff,)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
vs.)	
MANDALAY CORPORATION, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Presently before the court is Defendants Mandalay Corporation dba Mandalay Bay Resort and Casino, Sean Diccico, Susan Wolfla, Shaun Sanders, Ray Sanchez, Jeffrey Davis, and Richard Hoffman’s Motion to Strike (ECF No. 22), filed on July 11, 2016. Plaintiff Aristide Nouchet did not file a response.

Defendants move to strike a document titled “Statement to the Court” (ECF No. 21) that Plaintiff filed on June 24, 2016, which consists of various factual allegations against Defendants. Defendants argue that it is unclear whether Plaintiff is attempting to amend his complaint or to make discovery disclosures, but that regardless of the purpose of the document, it is a rogue document that does not comply with the court’s rules and therefore must be stricken. Defendants further argue that the allegations in the document are redundant, immaterial, and impertinent.

Under Local Rule 7-2(d), the “failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion . . . constitutes a consent to granting of the motion.” Additionally, Local Rule IA 7-1 requires that “[a]ll communications with the court must be styled as a motion, stipulation, or notice, and must be filed in the court’s docket and served on all other attorneys and pro se parties. The court may strike any case-related correspondence filed in the court’s docket that is not styled as a motion, stipulation, or notice.”

