

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 CONNIE MCDANEL,)
4)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.)
7 MICHAEL G. MCDANEL,)
8 Defendant.)

Case No.: 2:17-cv-00492-GMN-NJK

ORDER


9 Pending before the Court is the Motion to Strike, (ECF No. 7), filed by Defendant
10 Michael G. McDanel (“Defendant”). Plaintiff Connie McDanel (“Plaintiff”) filed a Response,
11 (ECF No. 16), and Defendant filed a Reply, (ECF No. 20).

12 Prior to Defendant’s Reply, however, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint. (ECF No.
13 18). “[A]n amended complaint supersedes the original, the latter being treated thereafter as
14 non-existent.” Ramirez v. County of San Bernardino, 806 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir. 2015).
15 While Defendant references portions of the Amended Complaint in his Reply, the underlying
16 Motion to Strike pertains to the original complaint rather than the operative amended
17 complaint.

18 Accordingly,

19 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant’s Motion to Strike, (ECF No. 7), is
20 **DENIED** as moot. Defendant may file a renewed motion to strike as to the operative
21 complaint by August 21, 2017.

22 **DATED** this 8 day of August, 2017.

23
24 
25 _____
Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
United States District Judge