

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION

HOLLIS DEAN MARTZ

PLAINTIFF

v.

Civil No. 4:18-cv-04047

MATTHEW D. WEBB, Sevier County Detention
Center (“SCDC”); MICHAEL BARNES, SCDC;
THOMAS JACKSON, SCDC; KRIS HUNDLEY,
SDCD; TROY CRAVENS, SCDC; CHAD DOWDLE,
SCDC; ROBERT GENTRY, SCDC; WENDELL
RANDALL, SCDC; CHRISTOPHER WOLLCOT, SCDC;
And SHERIFF BENNY SIMMONS

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Before the Court is a Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 39) filed by Plaintiff. Defendants have not responded, and the Court finds that no response is necessary.

Plaintiff asks for clarification as to why the Court entered an order on March 7, 2019 (ECF No. 37) denying his Motion for Subpoena (ECF No. 34) before he filed his “Rebuttal” (ECF No. 38) to Defendants’ Response. (ECF No. 36). The Court is not required to explain the rules of procedure to a *pro se* litigant. However, Plaintiff is advised that other than a motion for summary judgment, neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Local Rules for the Western District of Arkansas give a litigant the right to file a reply, or as Plaintiff’s calls it, a rebuttal to a response to a motion. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 39) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 22nd day of March 2019.

/s/ Barry A. Bryant

HON. BARRY A. BRYANT
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

