

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \* \* \*

KEVIN FERNANDEZ,	)	3:12-cv-00401-LRH-WGC
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	ORDER
DR. CENTRIC, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

Before the Court is Plaintiff Kevin Fernandez’s (“Fernandez”) Objection to the Magistrate Judge’s Order (Doc. #227<sup>1</sup>) pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-1. Doc. #233. A magistrate judge’s orders operate as final determinations of pretrial matters under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule IB 1-3. Accordingly, a district judge may reconsider a magistrate judge’s order only if it is “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); LR IB 3-1(a).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings and documents on file in this matter, and concludes that Fernandez’s objection to the Magistrate Judge’s denial of his Motion to Compel Supplementary Responses (Doc. #226) is without merit. As the Magistrate Judge noted in its October 1, 2013 Order, it is impossible to ascertain whether the discovery requests in the Motion at issue (Doc. #226) pertain in any way to the discovery requests in an earlier motion (Doc. #121). See Doc. #227, p. 2. Accordingly, Fernandez was not relieved of the obligation to attach

---

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

1 the discovery pursuant to Local Rule 26-7.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, because the discovery in the Motion at  
2 issue (Doc. #226) did not relate to the discovery requests in the earlier Motion (Doc. #121),  
3 Fernandez's Motion (Doc. #226) was not authorized pursuant to the Magistrate Judge's stay on  
4 discovery. *See* Doc. #200. For all of the aforementioned reasons, the Court finds that the  
5 Magistrate Judge's Order (Doc. #227) was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

6  
7 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Fernandez's Objection (Doc. #233) is  
8 OVERRULED.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED this 6th day of May, 2014.

11  
12   
13 LARRY R. HICKS  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>2</sup> The Magistrate Judge's April 22, 2013 Order permitting departure from the provisions  
28 of Local Rule 26-7 pertained *only* to the discovery that was the subject of Fernandez's earlier  
Motion (Doc. #121). *See* Doc. #200, p. 4 n. 3.