Cox v. Whorton et al Doc. 78

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA 6 7 8 STEVE MICHAEL COX, 3:08-CV-110-RCJ(VPC) 9 Plaintiff, **ORDER** 10 v. 11 GLEN WHORTON, et al., 12 Defendants. 13 14 Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for the Record of Formal Objections' to Court's (6-4-10) 15 Order (#64) Denying Plaintiff's Request for Discovery (First); Production of Documents and Request 16 for Admissions (#65) filed on June 28, 2010. Defendants' Opposition to Motion for the Record of 17 Formal Objections' to Court's (6-9-10)'s Order Denying Plaintiff's Request for Discovery (First); 18 Production of Documents and Request for Admissions (#66) was filed on July 7, 19 The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion, and 20 other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636 (b)(1), and concludes that the Magistrate 21 Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. 22 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Order (#64) will, therefore, be sustained 23 and Plaintiff's Motion for the Record of Formal Objections' to Court's (6-4-10) Order (#64) Denying 24 Plaintiff's Request for Discovery (First); Production of Documents and Request for Admissions (#65) 25 is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 DATED: this 13th day of August, 2010. 27 28

ROBERT C. JONES UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE