

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TONY G. HEWITT,	)	3:11-cv-00642-RCJ-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
	)	
vs.	)	July 30, 2012
	)	
OFFICER WILSON, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

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

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is what plaintiff styles “Motion for Sanctions #2.” (Doc. #50.) Defendants did not respond to plaintiff’s motion, but instead filed a “Motion to Stay Briefing on Plaintiff’s Motion for Sanctions #2 (Doc. #50) and Other Motions Plaintiff May File, Pending the Court’s Ruling on Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #28).”

Typically, motions for sanctions relate to discovery disputes. Instead, plaintiff’s motion complains of alleged mistreatment by two Department of Corrections officers (Frobes and Kerpatrick) who are not parties to this action. (Doc. #50 at 2.) The court notes the instant motion was filed the same day the court addressed plaintiff’s earlier motion for sanctions (Doc. #49). At the hearing on July 11, 2012, the court denied plaintiff’s motion for sanctions (Doc. #49): “While the alleged interference with mail plaintiff claims he was experiencing may be the subject of a grievance, it was found not to be an appropriate basis for a motion for sanctions.” (Doc. #51.)

The same rationale applies to the instant motion, i.e., that the subject matter might be more appropriate for a grievance, but not a motion for sanctions, particularly as against two individuals who are neither parties nor counsel to this action.

///

