Winans v. Thomas et al Doc. 70

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

2.12 are 00005 DCI WCC

CORT WINAINS,		) 5:12-cv-00095-RCJ-WGC
***	Plaintiff,	) MINUTES OF THE COURT
VS.		) February 15, 2013
CCS. THOMAS, et a	ıl.,	)
	Defendants.	) ) _)
PRESENT: THE H	ONORABLE WILLL	AM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
DEPUTY CLERK:	KATIE LYNN OGI	DEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING
COUNSEL FOR PLA	AINTIFF(S): <u>NONE</u>	APPEARING
COUNSEL FOR DE	FENDANT(S): NON	IE APPEARING

## MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

CODY WINIANG

Before the court is "Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Respondents Reply to Oppose Various Motions Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) LR 7-2(d)." (Doc. # 69.) Plaintiff bases his motion on the "failure of a moving party to file points and authorities in support of their motion to refure (sic) to Local Rules and Practice and not specifically state the Rule L-R 7-2(d) failure to file Points and Authorities" and that such "failure . . . shall constitute a concent (sic) of denial of the motion" (*id.* at 1).<sup>1</sup>

While Plaintiff does not specify which document(s) he seeks to have the court strike, presumably it is Defendant's opposition to Plaintiff's motion to amend. Plaintiff concludes his motion as follows:

"Respondents reply to opposition to not grant leave L-R 15-1 or F.R.C.P. 15, 17, 19 & 20 to correct defects in his initial complaints as stated herein should be allowed. \* \* \* Plaintiff ask (sic) the court to except (sic) his previous supplemental if not allow to send it back to him to change the heading to Amended Complaint."

(*id.* at 11.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The court notes that Plaintiff has been the moving party in 17 of the 18 motions filed in this case. Further, while the Defendant is the moving party in Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, the Defendant has not filed any reply to any motions.

## MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:12-cv-00095-RCJ-WGC Date: February 15, 2013

Page 2

Therefore, it appears that Plaintiff is seeking is to have the court grant his motions to amend and related filings (Docs. # 58, 59, 60 and 64), which this court has already ruled upon. (See Order, 2/7/13, Doc. # 67.)

Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 69) is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LAN	CE S. WILSON,	CLERK	
Ву: _	/s/		
	Deputy Clerk		