

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  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

WILLIAM BRECK,

Case No. 3:12-cv-00649-MMD-CLB

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

ROGER DOYLE, et al.,

Defendants.

This case arises from a state attorney-discipline matter. The Court previously issued an order granting two motions to dismiss, and pro se Plaintiff William Breck appealed. (ECF Nos. 185 (“Order”), 191 (notice of appeal).) The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the Order in part, reversed in part, and remanded for further proceedings consistent with its decision. (ECF No. 197.) In particular, the court of appeals reversed this Court’s dismissal of Plaintiff’s claims against the Individual Defendants<sup>1</sup> (nine individuals who participated in his disciplinary proceedings) for damages unrelated to the State Bar of Nevada’s disciplinary order. (Id. at 4-6.) The court of appeals found that this Court committed error in applying state law immunity to claims against these Defendants, though it noted that federally-recognized common-law immunities may apply. (Id. at 5-6.) Accordingly, the Court’s Order (ECF No. 185) and Judgment (ECF No. 186) are vacated as they relate to the Individual Defendants.

///

///

///

---

<sup>1</sup>David Clark, Kimberly Farmer, Laura Peters, Patrick King, J. Thomas Susich, Caren Cafferata-Jenkins, and Kathleen Breckenridge, collectively, the “Individual Defendants.” (ECF No. 130 at 1.)

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

It is therefore ordered that the Individual Defendants will have 30 days from the date of entry of this order to respond to the operative complaint (ECF No. 124).

DATED THIS 16<sup>th</sup> day of December 2019.



---

MIRANDA M. DU  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE