

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JOSEPH DOWNING,

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. KHAN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-000082-ART-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 88]

11 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for court rules and procedures. Docket No.  
12 88. The motion is properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

13 Plaintiff's motion is not a proper motion before the Court. Plaintiff initiated this action by  
14 filing his complaint and it is his obligation to familiarize himself with the applicable rules and  
15 procedures to the best of his ability—an obligation that extends to all *pro se* plaintiffs. Moreover,  
16 the Court does not perform legal work on behalf of any party, including parties proceeding *pro se*.  
17 *See U-Haul Co. of Nevada, Inc. v. Gregory J. Kramer, Ltd.*, 2013 WL 4505800, at \*2 (D. Nev.  
18 Aug. 21, 2013) (“[T]he idea that courts will not perform the work of representing the parties is  
19 clear”); *see also Jacobsen v. Filler*, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364 (9th Cir. 1986) (“[P]ro se litigants in the  
20 ordinary civil case should not be treated more favorably than parties with attorneys of record”).  
21 Plaintiff provides no legal basis that the Court may send him court rules and procedures.

22 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for court rules and procedures is **DENIED**. Docket No.  
23 88.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: October 23, 2024

26  
27  
28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge