UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3

6

7

8

1

2

4 Gary Topolewski, et al.,

2:16-cv-01588-JAD-NJK

5

v.

Order Denying Motions for Attorney's Fees

Paula Blyschak, et al.,

Plaintiffs

Defendants

[ECF Nos. 52, 53]

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

On November 6, 2016, I granted defendants Lee A. Cowley, Joshua Woods, Vivian Cheung, Amir A. Fazel, Aman Walia, Jacqui Ross, Andrea Mosher and their law firm Cowley and Company Law Firm ("the Cowley defendants") and Tim Kilbrais's dismissal motions, and I dismissed all claims against these defendants with prejudice based on lack of personal jurisdiction, noting that plaintiff's claims also either failed as a matter of law or as plead. And because I found that these defects could not be cured by amendment, I denied plaintiff's motion for leave to amend. The Cowley defendants and Kilbrais now separately move for attorney's fees and costs under FRCP 54(d) and NRS 18.010(2).

Though defendants address the merits of plaintiff's claims and argue that the claims were brought or maintained without reasonable grounds as required for an award of fees under NRS 18.010, neither party complies with the requirements of Local Rule 54-14, which requires parties

2122

¹ ECF Nos. 11, 12.

23

24

² At the hearing on the dismissal motions and motion for leave to amend, plaintiffs' consented to dismissal of all claims brought by Gary Topolewski and Bud Zukaloff leaving only Metal Jeans, Inc. as a plaintiff.

2526

³ I did not reach defendants' claim-preclusion arguments.

27

⁴ ECF No. 24.

28

⁵" ECF Nos. 52, 53.

will be with prejudice. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants' motions for attorney's fees [ECF Nos. 52, 53] are DENIED without prejudice. Defendants have until April 4, 2017, to file renewed motions for attorney's fees.

United States District Judge

14(b)(3). Likewise, Kilbrai attaches no documentation to support his request for more than double

March 21, 2017

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

⁶ Kilbrai attaches a supplemental attorney affidavit to his reply, but I decline to consider this information because it was provided for the first time in the reply, which deprived plaintiff of a fair opportunity to respond to it. See ECF No. 66-1.