| Redenius v. Palme     | er et al D   |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5 |  |
| 7                     | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |
| 8                     | DISTRICT OF NEVADA   |
| 9                     |  |
| 10                    | DUSTIN OWEN REDENIUS, )  |
| 11                    | Petitioner, ) 3:14-cv-00538-RCJ-VPC  |
| 12                    | vs. ) ORDER  |
| 13                    | JACK PALMER, et al.,   |
| 14                    | Respondents.   |
| 15                    |  |
| 16                    |  |
| 17                    | On February 17, 2016, respondents filed a motion asking this court to reconsider its order |
| 18                    | denying their motion to strike – i.e., ECF No. 29. ECF No. 30. The court has considered    |
| 19                    | respondents' arguments in support of its motion and declines to reconsider its decision.   |
| 20                    | <b>IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED</b> that respondents' motion for reconsideration (ECF No.       |
| 21                    | 30) is DENIED.   |
| 22                    | Dated this 20th day of September, 2016.  |
| 23                    | O(1)   |
| 24                    | UNITED STATES DISFRICT JUDGE   |
| 25                    |  |
| 26                    | V  |
|                       |  |

Doc. 44