(PC)Scott v.	Palmer et al
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IINITED OTATEC DICTRICT COURT
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	FLOYD SCOTT, CASE NO. 1:09-cv-01329-AWI-SKO PC
10	Plaintiff, ORDER STRIKING REPLY TO ANSWER
11	v. (Doc. 36)
12	J. PALMER, et al.,
13	Defendants.
14	/
15	Plaintiff Floyd Scott, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action pursuant
16	to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on July 29, 2009. This action is proceeding against Defendants Palmer, Rivera,
17	and Lopez for excessive force, in violation of the Eighth Amendment. On July 5, 2011, Plaintiff
18	filed a reply to Defendants' answer.
19	Neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Local Rules provides for a reply to an
20	answer, absent an order from the Court requiring one. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a)(7). In this case, the Court
21	did not order a reply to the answer. Accordingly, Plaintiff's reply to Defendants' answer, filed July
22	5, 2011, is HEREBY ORDERED STRICKEN from the record.
23	
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.
25	Dated: July 7, 2011 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26	CTATES STATES IMPOSSIBLE VODGE
27	
28	
	1

Doc. 37