UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

EDWARD COULSON,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

ORDER

SOUTHERN NEVADA MOVERS,

Defendant(s).

Defendant(s).

Plaintiff is proceeding in this case *pro se* and, on September 21, 2016, he filed six different motions. This order resolves five of those motions: (a) motion for status hearing (Docket No. 11); (b) motion to schedule a preliminary hearing (Docket No. 12); (c) motion to set a trial date (Docket No. 13); (d) motion for a Rule 16 hearing (Docket No. 14); and (e) motion for appointment of *pro bono* counsel (Docket No. 15). With respect to the three motions to set various hearings, the Court finds a hearing not appropriate at this time. With respect to the motion to set a trial date, that motion is premature because a trial date will be set (if the case survives the pleadings and dispositive motions) once a joint pretrial order is submitted. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 16-4, Local Rule 26-1(b)(5). With respect to the motion for appointment of *pro bono* counsel, the Court finds that appointment

¹ In response to the motion to dismiss, Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal. Docket No. 8. This notice of appeal does not divest the Court of jurisdiction to resolve the matters currently pending here. *See, e.g., Nascimento v. Dummer*, 408 F.3d 905, 910 (9th Cir. 2007) ("when an improper appeal is taken, the district court retains its jurisdiction to act on the case").

of counsel is not appropriate in this case. *Cf.* Gen. Order 2014-01 (outlining standards for referral to the Court's *pro bono* pilot program). Accordingly, the motions at Docket Nos. 11-15 are **DENIED**.

The Court recognizes that Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and may lack extensive experience in civil litigation in federal court. As such, Plaintiff is advised that he should refrain from filing excessive and unnecessary motions on the docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 23, 2016

NANCY J. KORPE

United States Magistrate Judge