

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 GREGORY WEST  
7 ENTSMINGER,

8 v.

9 ROMEO ARANAS, *et al.*,

10 Plaintiff,  
Defendants.

11 Case No. 3:16-cv-00555-MMD-WGC  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

11 ORDER  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Before the Court is Plaintiff Gregory West Entsminger's objection (ECF No. 235) to United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb's order ("the Order") denying Plaintiff's motion to authorize the United States Marshal Service ("USMS") to locate unserved defendants (ECF No. 226 (denying ECF No. 224)), and Defendants' Motion to Strike Objection to Report and Recommendation ("Defendants' Motion") (ECF No. 225). For the following reasons, the Court overrules Plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 235) and denies Defendants' Motion (ECF No. 225) as moot.<sup>1</sup>

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 the Order on July 13, 2020. Accordingly, Plaintiff had until July 27, 2020 to object. But Plaintiff filed his objection on August 6, 2020. (ECF No. 235.) The Court therefore overrules Plaintiff's objection as untimely.

Defendants' Motion requests that the Court strike Plaintiff's response (ECF No. 214) supporting Judge Cobb's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") (ECF No. 203). (ECF

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court has also reviewed Plaintiff's response (ECF No. 226).

1 No. 225 at 2.) Defendants contend that, rather than stating an objection to the R&R,  
2 Plaintiff inaptly seeks an order directing the USMS and the Nevada Attorney General's  
3 Office to assist Plaintiff with effectuating service on certain unserved Defendants. (*Id.*) But  
4 the Court already denied such requests as beyond the scope of a response to the R&R.  
5 (ECF No. 217 at 2 n.1 (citing to LR IC 2-2(b)).) Accordingly, the Court will deny Defendants'  
6 Motion as moot.

7 The Court notes that the parties made several arguments and cited to several cases  
8 not discussed above. The Court has reviewed these arguments and cases and determines  
9 that they do not warrant discussion as they do not affect the outcome of the objection and  
10 motion before the Court.

11 It is therefore ordered that Plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 235) is overruled.

12 It is further ordered that Defendants' Motion to Strike Objection to Report and  
13 Recommendation (ECF No. 225) is denied as moot.

14 DATED THIS 20<sup>th</sup> day of August 2020.

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