

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

STEVEN T. MARVIK,	)	3:11-cv-00655-LRH-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	February 26, 2013
	)	
DR. NEIGBORS, <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 Plaintiff’s “Motion to Dispute and Strike Defendant(s) Claim(s) to Grant Any Relief of Anyway Whatsoever Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 7(a)(3), Rule 13 and Any Case Law(s) Thereof et.al. Defendants Can’t Legally Ask For Any Relief When This Court Determined the Legality of this Case Not Plaintiff, so Defendant(s) Only Relief Would Have to be Brought Against this Honorable Court and not the Plaintiff et.al.” (Doc. # 57.)

Try as it might, the court is unable to understand what Plaintiff is saying in the motion and what relief is sought. The document is simply incomprehensible.

Plaintiff’s “motion to dispute and strike” (Doc. # 57) is **DENIED** without prejudice to Plaintiff filing a Motion that can be understood by the court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By:         /s/    
Deputy Clerk