

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

MARIA M. MADERA,

Plaintiff,

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.; et al.,

Defendants.

3:11-cv-0777-LRH-WGC

ORDER

Before the court are various motions of the defendants including: (1) motion to dismiss (Doc. #31<sup>1</sup>); motion to strike (Doc. #38); (3) motion to strike (Doc. #39); (4) motion to dismiss (Doc. #40); and (5) motion to dismiss (Doc. #41). Plaintiff Maria M. Madera (“Madera”) did not file an opposition to any of the motions.

On January 4, 2012, the court dismissed Madera’s complaint for failure to state a claim. Doc. #29. In response, plaintiff Madera, without leave of court, filed two additional amended complaints to which defendants have filed the present motions to strike. Madera did not oppose defendants’ motions. Thus, pursuant to LR 7-2(d), her failure to file points and authorities in response to the motions to strike constitutes her consent to the court granting those motions. Accordingly, the court shall grant defendants’ motions to strike and strike the two amended

---

<sup>1</sup> Refers to the court’s docket entry number.

1 complaints on file in this matter.

2 As to defendants' remaining motions to dismiss, the court finds the pending motions moot  
3 and shall deny them accordingly.

4

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants' motions to dismiss (Doc. ##31, 40, 41)  
6 are DENIED as moot.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants' motions to strike (Doc. ##38, 39) are  
8 GRANTED. The clerk of court is directed to STRIKE plaintiff's amended complaints  
9 (Doc. ##36, 37).

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED this 17th day of May, 2012.

12

13

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LARRY R. HICKS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26