ı									
1	Howard & Howard PLLC								
2	Robert L. Rosenthal, Bar No. 6476								
	James A. Kohl, Bar No. 5692								
3	Shelley L. Lanzkowsky, Bar No. 9096								
	3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1400								
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89169								
5	Telephone: (702) 257-1483								
	Facsimile: (702) 567.1568								
6	rrosenthal@howardandhoward.com								
İ									
7	Attorneys for Cycalona Gowen								
8									
۲	UNITED STAT								

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CYCALONA GOWEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TILTWARE LLC, FULL TILT POKER, POCKET KINGS LIMITED, POCKET KINGS CONSULTING, LIMITED, KOLYMA CORPORATION, TILTPROOF, INC., RAYMOND BITAR, an individual, HOWARD LEDERER, an individual, ANDREW BLOCH, an individual, PHILLIP IVEY, an individual, CHRISTOPHER FERGUSON, an individual, JOHN JUANDA, an individual, PHILLIP GORDON, an individual, ERICK LINDGREN, an individual, ERIK SEIDEL, an individual, JENNIFER HARMAN-TRANIELLO, an individual, MICHAEL MATUSOW, an individual, ALLEN CUNNINGHAM, an individual, GUS HANSEN, an individual, AND PATRIK

Defendants.

ANTONIUS, an individual,

CASE NO. 2:08-CV-01581-RCJ-RJJ

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER DENYING AS MOOT [79] MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY; DENYING AS MOOT [80] MOTION FOR SANCTIONS RE DISCOVERY; AND, DENYING AS MOOT [82] MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER BASED ON A RULING BY THE COURT AT THE HEARING HELD 4/27/2009, GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS

Page 1 of 4

3

6

9

3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 1400 Howard & Howard, Attorneys PLLC

Las Vegas, NV 89169 (702) 257-1483

22

26

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

A. DEFENDANT **TILTWARE** DID NOT MOVE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS FOR ACCOUNTING AND QUANTUM MERUIT, HAVE DISMISSED **THOSE CAUSES** COULD NOT THEREFORE, THE COURT SHOULD RECONSIDER ITS ORDER VACATING THE HEARING SET FOR APRIL 30, 2009 AND PROCEED AS SCHEDULED.

A district court has the inherent power to reconsider and modify its interlocutory orders prior to the entry of judgment. Smith v. Massachussets, 543 U.S. 462, 475 125 S.Ct. 1129, 1139 (2005). On February 20, 2009, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Defendants' Motion did not move to dismiss Plaintiff's claims for Accounting ad Quantum Meruit against Defendant Tiltware. See Transcript of Proceedings of Telphonic Hearing On Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion, No. 58 p. lines 15-21.

On April 25, 2009, the Court granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss to the extent that Defendants Tiltware, Bitar, and Lederer were dismissed without prejudice, and the remaining individual Defendants were dismissed with prejudice. During the hearing there was no mention of Plaintiff's Accounting and Quantum Meruit claims. Therefore, unless the Court dismissed those claims sua sponte (of which there was no discussion), they still remain. Accordingly, Tiltware must file an Answer, and Plaintiff should be permitted to conduct discovery related to those causes of action.

Further, due to the fact that Plaintiff's Accounting and Quantum Meruit claims still exist, Tiltware does not have the right to a protective order or to cause further delay. See Twin City Fire Ins. Co. v. Employers Ins. Of Wausau, 124 F.R.D. 652, 653 (D. Nev. 1989). As such, the Motions which were set to be heard on April 30, 2009, should not be vacated as moot, and they should proceed as scheduled.

Howard Hughes Pkwy., Surte 14 Las Vegas, NV 89169 (702) 257-1483

II.
CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court reconsider its Order and conduct the April 30, 2009 hearing as previously scheduled.

Dated: This 28th day of April, 2009

HOWARD & HOWARD PLLC

By:/s/ James A. Kohl
James A. Kohl, Bar No. 5692
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Ste. 1400
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

CERT	'IFI	CA	\TF	E OF	FSE	RV	VΙ	CE

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of HOWARD & HOWARD and that on this 28th day of April 2009, I did cause a true copy of the foregoing PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER DENYING AS MOOT [79] MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY; DENYING AS MOOT [80] MOTION FOR SANCTIONS RE DISCOVERY; AND, DENYING AS MOOT [82] MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER BASED ON A RULING BY THE COURT AT THE HEARING HELD 4/27/2009, GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS to be served via electronic service on the following counsel of record.

Thomas D. Dillard, Jr., Esq. Walter R. Cannon, Esq. Olson, Cannon, Gormley & Desruisseaux 9950 W. Cheyenne Avenue Las Vegas, NV 89129

George M. Belfield, Esq. Valerie W. Ho, Esq. Greengerg Traurig, LLP 2450 Colorado Avenue Santa Monica, CA 90404

An employee of Howard & Howard