

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| _____                 | ) |
| LISA BONTA,           | ) |
|                       | ) |
| Plaintiff,            | ) |
|                       | ) |
| vs.                   | ) |
|                       | ) |
| WASHOE COUNTY et al., | ) |
|                       | ) |
| Defendants.           | ) |
| _____                 | ) |

3:18-cv-00012-RCJ-WGC

**ORDER**

This case arises out of the treatment of a disabled witness by first responders at the scene of a shooting. Plaintiff sued Washoe County (“the County”) and the City of Reno (“the City”) for failure to accommodate under the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) and the Rehabilitation Act (“RA”). The County and the City separately moved to dismiss. The Court granted the motions, with leave to amend. Plaintiff amended, and the County and the City again have separately moved to dismiss.

Plaintiff has responded with an oversized briefing, without requesting leave to exceed the page limits. The City has therefore asked the Court to strike the response and stay the time to reply. The Court grants the motion. The page limit for motions to dismiss and responses thereto is twenty-four. L.R. 7-3(b). There is no good cause to increase the page limit based on the fact that the response is a consolidated response to the separate motions to dismiss, because the total

1 pages of substantive argument in those motions is not more than twenty-four, but only fourteen.  
2 *See* L.R. 7-3(c). Even if Defendants' substantive arguments totaled over twenty-four pages, such  
3 that there might be good cause to permit a consolidated, oversized response (as opposed to two  
4 separate, normal-sized responses) for the sake of efficiency, Plaintiff made no request to file an  
5 oversized brief, and because such requests must be made before the brief is due, a retroactive  
6 request would be in violation of the rule and therefore could not be granted. *See id.*


7 **CONCLUSION**

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Strike (ECF No. 31) is GRANTED, and  
9 the Response (ECF No. 30) is STRICKEN.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a consolidated response to the Motions to Dismiss  
11 (ECF Nos. 28, 29) of no more than twenty-four (24) pages is due within seven (7) days of this  
12 Order, and any replies of no more than twelve (12) pages are due within seven (7) days  
13 thereafter. Failure to comply may constitute a consent to the granting of the motions to dismiss  
14 under Local Rule 7-2(d).

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated this 25th day of September, 2018.

17  
18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 ROBERT C. JONES  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24