

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA
RENO, NEVADA

JOSEPH MORENO,)	CASE NO. 3:11-CV-00179-ECR-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	MINUTES OF THE COURT
)	
vs.)	DATED: JUNE 11, 2012
)	
CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, et al.,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	

PRESENT: HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB , U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Deputy Clerk: Katie Lynn Ogden Reporter: FTR: 9:34:25 a.m. - 10:17:57 a.m.

Counsel for Plaintiff(s): Joseph Moreno, In Pro Per (Telephonically)

Counsel for Defendant(s): Jeffrey Paul Hoppe

PROCEEDINGS: **MOTION HEARING**

9:34 a.m. Court convenes.

The Court reviews the status of this case with the parties and determines that Plaintiff’s Reply to Defendants’ Answer (Dkt. No. 73) is an unnecessary filing and that to the extent the document seeks any relief, it is deemed moot. The Court further notes that Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 59) and Defendants’ Answer to the Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 67) results in Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 57) as being moot and no longer pending before the Court. Therefore, Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No 55) is deemed **moot** (as previously ordered in court order Dkt. No 58).

The Court inquires about Plaintiff’s motion entitled “*Respectfully Requesting Relief of Defendants Retaliation*” (Dkt. No. 55) and whether a response has been filed to the motion. Mr. Hoppe explains that it appears that the response was drafted but has not been submitted for filing. The Court requests Mr. Hoppe to file the response as soon as possible.

Turning to Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 52), the Court asks Mr. Moreno that out of the sixteen document requests in his request for production, which specific requests need to be addressed during this hearing to resolve any disputes. Mr. Moreno identifies request #6, #12, #15, and #16 that need to be addressed. After hearing argument from both Mr. Moreno and Mr. Hoppe the Court orders the following regarding the four requests for production:

