

1 GARY M. RESTAINO  
United States Attorney  
2 District of Arizona  
DENISE ANN FAULK  
3 Assistant U.S. Attorney  
State Bar No. 12700  
4 United States Courthouse  
405 W. Congress Street, Suite 4800  
5 Tucson, Arizona 85701  
Telephone: (520) 620-7300  
6 Email: [denise.faulk@usdoj.gov](mailto:denise.faulk@usdoj.gov)  
Attorneys for Defendants  
7

8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

10  
11 Keith Raniere,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 vs.  
14 Merrick Garland, et al.,  
15 Defendants.  
16  
17  
18

CV-22-00561-TUC-RCC

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
STRIKE PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO  
DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
PLAINTIFF'S STATEMENT OF  
FACTS AND CONTROVERTING  
STATEMENT OF FACTS IN  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
STATEMENT OF FACTS IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION  
*NUNC PRO TUNC***

19 Defendants Garland, Peters, Gutierrez and Ulrich, acting in their official capacities  
20 by and through undersigned counsel, hereby move to strike Plaintiff's Reply To  
21 Defendants' Response to Motion for Leave to File Plaintiff's Statement of Facts and  
22 Controverting Statement of Facts in Opposition to Defendants' Statement of Facts in  
23 Support of Defendants' Summary Judgment Motion *Nunc Pro Tunc* (Doc. 77) as untimely.  
24 This motion is supported by the attached memorandum of points and authorities and all  
25 matters of record.

26 **Memorandum of Points and Authorities**

27 **I. Background**

28 On May 1, 2023, Defendants filed their motion for summary judgment. (Doc. 35.)

1 Defendants supported the motion with a separate Statement of Facts (SOF). (Doc. 36.)  
2 The SOF was based on a sworn Declaration and authenticated documents. (*Id.*) On June  
3 21, 2024, over one year after the original deadline, Plaintiff filed his Response to the  
4 Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment on Exhaustion, without a controverting  
5 statement of facts. (Doc. 71.) On July 8, 2024, Defendants filed their reply, in which they  
6 noted Plaintiff’s failure to file a controverting statement of facts, *inter alia*. (Doc. 72 at 2.)  
7 The motion has been deemed ready for decision without oral argument since July 9, 2024.  
8 (Doc. 37 at 5.)

9 On August 13, 2024, Plaintiff filed his motion seeking leave to file a statement of  
10 facts and a controverting statement of facts untimely. (Doc. 73.) On August 27, 2024,  
11 Defendants filed their response opposing the motion. (Doc. 74.) On September 13, 2024,  
12 seventeen days later, Plaintiff filed his reply. (Doc. 77.)

## 13 **II. The Court Should Strike the Reply**

14 Rule 17.2(m)(1) provides that a motion to strike may be filed “if it seeks to strike  
15 any part of a filing or submission on the ground that it is prohibited (or not authorized) by  
16 a statute, rule, or court order.” LRCiv 17.2(m)(1). Rule 17.2(d) provides that “[t]he  
17 moving party, unless otherwise ordered by the Court, and except as otherwise provided by  
18 Rules 12.1 and 56.1, Local Rules of Civil Procedure, shall have seven (7) days after  
19 service of the responsive memorandum to file a reply memorandum if that party so  
20 desires.” LRCiv 17.2(d). Plaintiff filed his reply seventeen days after Defendants filed  
21 their response. (Doc. 77.) Plaintiff failed to request an extension of time to file it.  
22 (Docket, generally.) Thus, Plaintiff filed his reply ten days late.

23 The Court should exercise its discretion to strike Plaintiff’s Reply.

## 24 **III. Conclusion**

25 Based on the foregoing, this Court should strike Plaintiff’s Reply To Defendants’  
26 Response to Motion for Leave to File Plaintiff’s Statement of Facts and Controverting  
27 Statement of Facts in Opposition to Defendants’ Statement of Facts in Support of  
28 Defendants’ Summary Judgment Motion *Nunc Pro Tunc* (Doc. 77).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: September 16, 2023.

GARY M. RESTAINO  
United States Attorney  
District of Arizona

*s/ Denise Ann Faulk*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DENISE ANN FAULK  
Assistant U.S. Attorney

Copy of the foregoing  
served via CM/ECF to:

Arthur L Aidala  
Law Offices of Aidala, Bertuna  
& Kamins PC - Brooklyn, NY  
8118 13th Ave.  
Brooklyn, NY 11228  
Email: [aidalaesq@aidalalaw.com](mailto:aidalaesq@aidalalaw.com)  
Attorney for Plaintiff

*s/ M. Parker*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
/ MT Strike Reply - ND