

FILED	RECEIVED
ENTERED	SERVED ON
COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD	
SEP 11 2009	
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
BY: _____	DEPUTY

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

* * * * *

DAVID PUTZER, <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;">Plaintiff,</div>	}	3:07-cv-00498-LRH-RAM
vs.	}	<u>ORDER</u>
GLEN WHORTON, et al., <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 20px;">Defendants.</div>	}	}

Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal (#67), which the court will treat as a objection to the Magistrate's Order (#65).

The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's objection, 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. Regina Hendrickson's name shall be inserted in Plaintiff's complaint in the place of defendant John Doe #2. The Magistrate Judge denied a proposed amendment to the Request for Relief in Plaintiff's complaint. This court sustains the Magistrate's ruling because the requested modifications would be redundant, superfluous or beyond any relief available under the law.

The Magistrate Judge's Order (#65) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion (#67) is denied.

Also before the court is Plaintiff's motion to "direct the entry of a final judgment as to Notice of Appeal dated December 30, 2008, filed" (#100), Defendants' opposition (#102) and Plaintiff's reply (#104). The Magistrate Judge's rulings are purely interlocutory and there have

1 been no dismissals of any claims and no showing of grounds which would warrant an
2 interlocutory appeal. Plaintiff's motion (#100) is denied.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED this 11th day of September, 2009.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE