

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

CORY WINANS,	)	3:12-cv-00095-RCJ-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
vs.	)	
	)	April 17, 2013
CCS. THOMAS,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

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 Compell (sic) Discovery - Motion to Strike Summary Judgment as Discovery is Pending." (Doc. # 73.) Defendant has opposed (Doc. # 74). The court will address the two components of Plaintiff's motion separately.

Motion to Compel

With regard to the motion to compel, Plaintiff has not attached the discovery which is in dispute. The Local Rules for the District of Nevada require all discovery motions to state the efforts movant first undertook to resolve the discovery dispute which is the subject of the motion. LR 26-7(b). While this particular requirement may be difficult for a plaintiff who is a pro se inmate to satisfy, Plaintiff has also not complied with LR 26-7(a) which requires the motion to compel to "set forth in full the text of the discovery originally sought and the response thereto, if any." Because of Plaintiff failure to comply with the requirements of Rule 26-7(a), it is impossible for the court to grant any relief.

Therefore, the discovery component of Plaintiff's motion to compel is **DENIED.**

///

