

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JAMES EUGENE HERMANSON,)	3:15-cv-00526-RCJ-VPC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	November 17, 2016
)	
DEPUTY PARADA, DEPUTY VERDUGO,)	
DEPUTY CHAMPA,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Defendants moved to dismiss on September 2, 2016. (ECF No. 23.) After plaintiff had opposed and defendants replied, plaintiff filed a “Notice Upon the Court” on September 27, 2016. (ECF No. 28.) Defendants move to strike the filing on the ground that the filing is an unauthorized surreply. (ECF No. 29 at 2-3.) The local rule governing motions briefing contemplates a motion, an opposition, and a reply, and expressly states that “[s]urreplies are not permitted without leave of court; motions for leave to file a surreply are discouraged.” LR 7-2(b). This remains true even where the filer is a *pro se* litigant. *Id.* (citing *Odoms v. Skolnik*, No. 3:09-cv-00223-RCJ-VPC, 2011 WL 2161391, at *5 (D. Nev. Apr. 18, 2011)).

Plaintiff did not request leave to file a surreply, and defendants did not raise new arguments in reply to plaintiff’s opposition. Therefore, defendants’ motion to strike (ECF No. 29) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

BY: /s/
Deputy Clerk