UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CHRISTOPHER A. JONES, Plaintiff, v. HOWARD SKOLNIK, *et al.*, Defendants.	3:10-cv-00162-LRH-VPC **MINUTES OF THE COURT** December 12, 2014

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is plaintiff's motion (#392) to stay the deadline for his opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss (#387). Plaintiff requests a stay, pending the court's ruling on his motion to strike defendants' motion to dismiss (#391). Defendants oppose (#401).

The court **DENIES** plaintiff's motion (#392). Because plaintiff is an experienced litigant, the court presumes that he is familiar with Local Rule 7-2(d), under which the failure to timely oppose a motion constitutes consent thereto. Rather than construing his failure as consent, the court will allow plaintiff until **December 22, 2014** to oppose the motion to dismiss. Defendants' reply shall be due on or by **January 2, 2015**.

Plaintiff is advised that the court will extend no further leniency for his failures to comply with filing deadlines simply because other pending motions may modify such deadlines. In other words, if plaintiff exercises his right to file a motion to stay in the future, he should not assume that the filing of such motion excuses the deadline sought to be stayed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/
Deputy Clerk