

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CORY WINANS,) 3:12-cv-00095-RCJ-WGC
)
Plaintiff,) MINUTES OF THE COURT
)
vs.)
) February 15, 2013
)
CCS. THOMAS, et al.,)
)
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 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 refile (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 concert (sic) of denial of the motion" (id. at 1).¹

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.)

¹ 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.

