

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMOND WRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

v.

SCOTT KEBNAN, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:07-cv-00462-AWI-SMS PC

ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S REPLY

(ECF No. 92)

Plaintiff Raymond Wright (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on the first amended complaint, filed March 27, 2008, against Defendants Lefler, Figueroa, Gonzalez, Hernandez and Rivera for interference with Plaintiff’s right of access to the courts; Defendants Lefler, Gonzalez, Rivera, Desbit, Lima, Peterson, Pearce, Baires, Pennington, Grannis, and Kernan for retaliation; and Defendants Lefler, Orozco and Miller for violations of the Equal Protection Clause. On June 16, 2011, Defendant Pennington filed an answer to the amended complaint and Plaintiff filed a reply on August 11, 2011.

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide, in relevant part, that there shall be a complaint, an answer, and a reply to an answer if the court orders one. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a). The Court has not ordered a reply to the answer and declines to make such an order. Therefore Plaintiff’s reply shall be stricken from the record.

///

///

1 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s reply, filed August 11, 2011, is
2 STRICKEN from the record.

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 **Dated: August 15, 2011**

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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