

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

**IN THE
HO-CHUNK NATION TRIAL COURT**

**IN THE MATTER OF
MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

Case No.: **Administrative Order 00-01**

INTRODUCTION

It has come to the Court’s attention that litigants and attorneys are commonly embedding *Motions to Dismiss* within other pleadings (e.g. *Answers*). While this practice is allowable under *Ho-Chunk Nation Rules of Civil Procedure*, Rule 19 (A), ambiguous language within recent filings has caused some confusion.

The *Ho-Chunk Rules of Civil Procedure*, Rule 18, mandates that the Court treat all “requests” as *Motions*. Confusion arises when parties “request” dismissal, but do not reflect this “request” in the caption. Parties proceeding *pro se*, or counsel not familiar with the *Ho-Chunk Nation Rules of Civil Procedure*, may easily overlook the embedded *Request/Motion*. Further, the Court wishes parties to clearly state the exact intention of documents filed with the Court so that time limitations mandated by the *Ho-Chunk Nation Rules of Civil Procedure* may be correctly administered.

THEREFORE, the Court orders that all “requests” and *Motions* must be clearly enumerated in the captions of the pleadings in which they appear. “Requests” and *Motions* not so enumerated will not be considered.

IT IS SO ORDERED January 12, 2000 at the Ho-Chunk Nation Trial Court in Black River Falls, Wisconsin from within the sovereign lands of the Ho-Chunk Nation.

Hon. Mark Butterfield
HCN Chief Trial Judge