

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

* * * * *

KEVIN LYNN FERNANDEZ,)	3:06-cv-00628-LRH-RAM
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

Before the court are the following:

1. Plaintiff’s Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate’s Decision Order (#153) (#158¹), Defendants’ Response to Plaintiff’s Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate’s Decision Order (#173), and Reply (#193).

The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff’s motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes that the Magistrate Judge’s ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

The Magistrate Judge’s Order (#153) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff’s motion (#158) is denied.

2. Plaintiff’s Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate’s Order (#178) (#194). Defendants responded (#214).

The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff’s motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes

¹Refers to this court’s docket number.

1 that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

2 The Magistrate Judge's Order (#178) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion
3 (#194) is denied.

4 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Review and Objections to Magistrate's Order Docket #231
5 (#243) and Defendants' Response (#253).

6 The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's
7 motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes
8 that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

9 The Magistrate Judge's Order (#231) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion
10 (#243) is denied.

11 4. Plaintiff's Motion for Stay of Order #231 (#244) and Defendants' Response
12 (#252).

13 The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's
14 motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) and denies
15 Plaintiff's motion (#244) based upon the immediately preceding ruling on Plaintiff's motion
16 (#243), which overruled the objection to the ordered deposition, and also upon the grounds of its
17 being moot in light of the deposition having been previously conducted.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED this 16th day of March, 2009.



20
21
22 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE