

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

WILLIE SMITH,)	3:13-cv-00202-MMD-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	June 25, 2014
)	
HOMES, 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 Defendants' Motion to Strike wherein Defendants seek an order of court striking Plaintiff's sur-reply to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [#54]. (Doc. # 58 at 1.) However, as reflected in the June 19, 2014 Report and Recommendation to District Judge Miranda M. Du, the court has already considered Plaintiff's June 10, 2014 response to Defendants' reply:

In his response to Defendants' reply (which Defendants have not moved to strike), Plaintiff argues that the release provision Defendants contend bars this action was not one of the terms the parties agreed to that was recited on the record in 3:12-cv-00024-LRH-VPC. (Doc. # 54.) While the Local Rules of Practice only permit the filing of a motion, response and reply, the court will afford Plaintiff, a pro se inmate litigant, with some latitude and will consider his response to Defendants' reply since the subject motion is potentially case-dispositive.

(Doc. # 57 at 3-4.)

Defendants' motion to strike (Doc. # 58) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/
Deputy Clerk