**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| SPENCER PIERCE, | ) | 3:10-CV-0239-ECR (VPC) |
| | ) | |
| Plaintiff, | ) | **MINUTES OF THE COURT** |
| | ) | |
| vs. | ) | March 25, 2011 |
| | ) | |
| HOWARD SKOLNIK, et al., | ) | |
| | ) | |
| Defendant(s). | ) | |
| | ) | |

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:**

The court has reviewed plaintiff's motion for TRO/preliminary injunction (#9), defendants' response (#15), plaintiff's letter (#17), and the court's screening order (#8). It appears to the court, that plaintiff's motion for TRO/preliminary injunction was inadvertently filed on the docket twice (#s 7 & 9). Plaintiff states in his letter that he should not have two motions for TRO/preliminary injunction on file, and that his original motion for TRO/preliminary injunction (#7) was denied (#8). Therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the second (duplicative) motion for TRO/preliminary injunction motion (#9) is DENIED as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/
Deputy Clerk

Dockets.Justia.com