

1

2

## 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5

\* \* \*

6

GREGORY WEST  
ENTSMINGER,

7

v.

8

Plaintiff,

9

ROMEO ARANAS, et al.,

10

Defendants.

11

Case No. 3:16-cv-00555-MMD-WGC

12

## ORDER

13

This is a civil rights case involving Plaintiff Gregory West Entsminger, who is in custody at the Northern Nevada Correctional Center. Before the Court is Plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 178) to United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb's orders denying Plaintiff's motion to compel ("MTC") (ECF No. 143 (denying ECF No. 126)) and motion for joinder of real party in interest ("MFJ") (ECF No. 161 (denying ECF No. 123)). Additionally, Plaintiff has filed a motion to supplement his objection (ECF No. 181) and motion for leave to file a reply to Defendant's opposition (ECF No. 189).<sup>1</sup> For the following reasons, the Court overrules Plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 178) and denies his remaining motions (ECF Nos. 181, 189) as moot.<sup>2</sup>

21

The Court finds that Plaintiff's objection is untimely. Under LR IB 3-1, a party must file their objection to a magistrate judge's order within 14 days after service of that order. The docket reflects that Plaintiff was electronically served a copy of ECF No. 143 on January 31, 2020, and a copy of ECF No. 161 on February 28, 2020. Accordingly, Plaintiff

25

26

27

<sup>1</sup>Although the title of Plaintiff's objection only refers to ECF No. 161, Plaintiff also objects to ECF No. 143, which the Court addresses. (See ECF No. 178 at 1, 11.)

28

<sup>2</sup>The Court has also reviewed Defendants' response (ECF No. 187).

1 had until February 14, 2020 to object to ECF No. 143, and March 13, 2020 to object to  
2 ECF No. 161. But Plaintiff filed his objection on April 1, 2020. (ECF No. 178.) The Court  
3 therefore overrules Plaintiff's objection as untimely.

4 The Court notes that the parties made several arguments and cited to several cases  
5 not discussed above. The Court has reviewed these arguments and cases and determines  
6 that they do not warrant discussion as they do not affect the outcome of the objection or  
7 motions before the Court.

8 It is therefore ordered that Plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 178) is overruled.

9 It is further ordered that Plaintiff's motion to file supplement (ECF No. 181) is denied  
10 as moot.

11 It is further ordered that Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a reply (ECF No. 189) is  
12 denied as moot.

13 DATED THIS 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April 2020.

14  
15   
16 MIRANDA M. DU  
17 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28