	Case 2:12-cv-02040-JAD-PAL Document 234 F	iled 10/02/14 Page 1 of 2
1		
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
4		
5	MARC J. RANDAZZA, an individual,	
6	JENNIFER RANDAZZA, an individual, and NATALIA RANDAZZA, an individual,	Case No.: 2:12-cv-2040-JAD-PAL
7	Plaintiffs,	Order Denying Motion for Default
8	V.	Judgment [Doc. 227]
9	CRYSTAL COX, an individual, et al.	
10	Defendants.	
11		
12	Defendant/Counterclaimant Crystal Cox has filed counterclaims that have been the subject of	
13	significant motion practice. Counterdefendant Randazza has filed both an amended answer to those	
14	counterclaims and recently moved (again) for their dismissal. Docs. 223, 224. In a five-sentence	
15	request, Cox now moves the court for a "default judgment" against Randazza because his answer to	
16	her (now significantly whittled down) counterclaims was not filed within 21 days. Doc. 227. She	
17	does not state when these 21 days began to run. Id. And as these claims were the subject of	
18	numerous pending motions—including a motion to dismiss—Randazza's deadline to respond was	
19	actually 14 days after the resolution of pending motions. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(4). Although	
20	Randazza did not file his answer until more than a month after the resolution of those motions, see	
21	Docs. 213, 220, he has since answered, amended his answer, and filed a new motion to dismiss. See	
22	Docs. 220, 223, 224. In sum, it is apparent in the more than 200 docket entries in this case that	
23	Randazza has pled and is actively defending against Cox's counterclaims, and her motion is denied	
24	on its merits. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a).	
25	Even if I did not reach the merits of Cox's motion for default judgment, I would have to deny	
26	it. Cox's request for a default judgment skips a critical procedural step: asking first for the entry of	
27	default. See id. And Local Rule 7-2 requires every motion to be supported by a memorandum of	
28	Page 1 of 2	

	Case 2:12-cv-02040-JAD-PAL Document 234 Filed 10/02/14 Page 2 of 2	
1	points and authorities. Cox's is not. See Doc. 227. These procedural deficiencies are independent	
2	reasons that Cox's motion for default judgment is—and must be—denied.	
3	Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Cox's Motion for Default Judgment [Doc. 227]	
4	is DENIED.	
5	DATED: October 2, 2014.	
6	(10)	
7	JENNIFER A. DORSEY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19 20		
20		
21		
22 23		
23 24		
24 25		
23 26		
20 27		
27		
20	Page 2 of 2	