

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Case No.: 3:17-cv-00683-MMD-WGC

STEVEN CITY BROOMFIELD,

Plaintiff

v.

ROMEO ARANAS, et. al.,

Defendants

**Order**

Re: ECF No. 79

Before the court is Plaintiff's motion for leave to file supplemental briefing in reply to Defendants' motion for summary judgment, stating that he did not know he had to file a reply to the motion. (ECF No. 79.)

Defendants filed their motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 40.) Plaintiff filed a response. (ECF Nos. 59, 61, 67, 72.) Defendants filed a reply brief. (ECF No. 77.)

Plaintiff also filed his own motion for summary judgment. (ECF Nos. 47, 47-1, 50-1.) Defendants filed a response. (ECF Nos. 53, 55-1 to 55-8.) Plaintiff filed a reply. (ECF No. 78.)

Briefing on these motions is complete. Plaintiff need not file a reply to Defendants' motion. He is only permitted to file his response/opposition, and then Defendants file a reply brief, which completes the briefing on the motion. *See* Local Rule 7-2.

Therefore, Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 79) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 19, 2020



William G. Cobb  
United States Magistrate Judge