

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

GUILLERMO RENTERIA-NOVOA,	)	3:15-cv-00537-MMD-VPC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	May 15, 2017
	)	
ISIDRO BACA, et al.,	)	
	)	
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:**

Before the court are several motions: ECF Nos. 15, 23, and 27.

On December 21, 2016, defendants filed their motion to extend time to file a motion to enforce settlement (ECF No. 15). Plaintiff opposed the motion (ECF No. 16). Defendants subsequently filed their motion to enforce settlement on December 30, 2016. Defendants' motion to extend time (ECF No. 15) is **GRANTED**.

On January 17, 2017, defendants moved to strike plaintiff's notice of change of address (ECF No. 20) and plaintiff's response to defendants' motion to enforce settlement (ECF No. 21). Defendants moved to strike these documents on the grounds that they were filed by another inmate who is not an attorney of record in the case and plaintiff failed to sign the documents. (ECF No. 23 at 2.) Local Rule IC 5-1(b) requires that "[t]he signatory must be the attorney or pro se party who electronically files the document." Further, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f) provides that the court may strike "any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter." Having thoroughly reviewed the documents, the court finds that the documents do not comply with the Local Rules, and they are "redundant, immaterial, [and] impertinent." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f). Accordingly, defendants' motion to strike (ECF No. 21) is **GRANTED**.

