

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

LHF PRODUCTIONS, INC.,)	Case No. 2:16-cv-01918-JAD-NJK
Plaintiff(s),)	ORDER
vs.)	(Docket Nos. 30, 44)
DERRICK BROUGHTON, et al.,)	
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is the order for Plaintiff to show cause why certain defendants should not be dismissed for lack of service and failure to prosecute. Docket No. 30.¹ In particular, that order noted that the amended complaint continued to identify 12 Doe Defendants despite more than eight months in which Plaintiff could conduct discovery, and further that no action had been taken against five named Defendants who had been served but had not yet appeared. *Id.* Plaintiff has now filed a response, along with a motion for a hearing. Docket Nos. 43, 44.

Following the issuance of the order to show cause, Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed the remaining Doe Defendants. Docket No. 37. As such, that issue is now moot. Also following the issuance of the order to show cause, Plaintiff has moved forward with its claims against the named Defendants who have been served but have not appeared by obtaining Clerk’s defaults. Docket No. 41. Given the circumstances, the Court will discharge the order to show cause with respect to these named Defendants.

¹ A second order to show cause was issued in this case. Docket No. 28. Plaintiff was given an extension to respond to that order to show cause, Docket No. 42, and it remains pending. This order does not resolve the issues raised therein.

1 For the foregoing reasons, the pending order to show cause at Docket No. 30 is hereby
2 **DISCHARGED**. Moreover, the Court finds a hearing unnecessary, so Plaintiff's motion for a hearing at
3 Docket No. 44 is **DENIED**. See Local Rule 78-1.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED

5 Dated: May 12, 2017

6 
7 _____
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28