

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**

NATHAN CHARLES CAREY,)	Case No.: 1:13-cv-00669-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S REPLY
)	TO ANSWER
v.)	
)	[ECF No. 15]
A. ALPHONSO, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Nathan Charles Carey is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This action is proceeding against Defendant Doctor Alphonso for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

On May 21, 2014, Defendant Alphonso filed an answer to the complaint.

On June 9, 2014, Plaintiff filed a reply to Defendant's answer.

Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides as follows:

There shall be a complaint and an answer; a reply to a counterclaim denominated as such; an answer to a cross-claim, if the answer contains a cross-claim; a third-party complaint, if a person who was not an original party is summoned under the provisions of Rule 14; and a third-party answer, if a third-party complaint is served. No other pleading shall be allowed, except that the court may order a reply to an answer or a third-party answer.

///

1 Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a). Because the Court did not order Plaintiff to reply to answer, Plaintiff's response
2 is HEREBY STRICKEN from the record.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 4, 2014



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE