

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

* * *

1st ONE HUNDRED INVESTMENT
POOL, LLC,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

CARMEN J. ROSE, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-CV-1233 JCM (PAL)

ORDER

Presently before this court is plaintiff 1st One Hundred Investment Pool, LLC's emergency motion to extend time to respond to defendants Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company ("BNY") and Sables, LLC's ("Sables") motions to dismiss. (ECF No. 14). BNY filed its motion to dismiss on May 26, 2017, (ECF No. 7) and Sables filed its motion to dismiss on May 30, 2017, (ECF No. 8).

Specifically, plaintiff argues that it does not want to incur legal fees to produce responses to the motions to dismiss before its May 26, 2017, motion to remand is adjudicated. See (ECF No. 14). Therefore, plaintiff requests "an order of continuance to file its responses to defendants' motions to dismiss, or, alternatively, a request for stay of briefing, until its motion for remand is resolved." (Id. at 1).

Plaintiff's requests will be denied for multiple procedural reasons. First, emergency consideration under Local Rule 7-4 is explicitly inapplicable to "requests for procedural relief, e.g., a motion to extend time to file a brief." LR 7-4. Second, the motion to remand is not yet ripe. See (ECF No. 6); see also LR 7-2(b). Finally, "[f]or each type of relief requested . . . a separate


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

document must be filed and a separate event must be selected for that document” on the electronic docketing system. LR IC 2-2(b).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff’s emergency motion (ECF No. 14) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

DATED June 7, 2017.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE