

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 BILAL AHDOM,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 C. ETCHEBEHERE, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16

1:13-cv-01623-DAD-GSA-PC

ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO FILE  
REPLY  
(ECF No. 70.)

17 **I. BACKGROUND**

18 Bilal Ahdom (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with this civil rights  
19 action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this Complaint commencing this  
20 action on October 9, 2013. (ECF No. 1.) This case now proceeds on Plaintiff’s Second  
21 Amended Complaint, filed on December 8, 2015, against defendant Associate Warden C.  
22 Etchebehere (“Defendant”) for violation of Plaintiff’s rights under the Free Exercise Clause of  
23 the First Amendment. (ECF No. 24.)

24 On August 21, 2017, the undersigned entered findings and recommendations,  
25 recommending that Defendant’s motion for summary judgment be granted. (ECF No. 63.) The  
26 parties were granted fourteen days in which to file objections to the findings and  
27 recommendations, with an additional seven days to file replies to any objections. (*Id.* at 59:8-  
28 13.) After being granted an extension of time, Plaintiff filed six objections to the findings and

1 recommendations on October 6, 2017. (ECF No. 68.) On October 13, 2017, Defendant filed a  
2 response to Plaintiff's objections. (ECF No. 69.)

3 On October 24, 2017, Plaintiff filed a request for leave to file a reply to Defendant's  
4 response to Plaintiff's objections. (ECF No. 70.)

5 **II. PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST**

6 Plaintiff requests permission to file a reply to Defendant's response to Plaintiff's  
7 objections to the findings and recommendations. In support of this request, Plaintiff merely  
8 states that when he received Defendant's response, he "discovered that there was a need to  
9 respond to the defendant's claims." (Id.)

10 Plaintiff's statement is not sufficient to show good cause for the court to allow him to  
11 file a reply. Plaintiff has not explained what he discovered in Defendant's response that  
12 requires a reply or why he failed to address the issue in his objections. The findings and  
13 recommendations only allowed the parties to file objections and replies to the objections.  
14 Plaintiff has not shown that a valid reason for an additional response exists. Therefore,  
15 Plaintiff's request shall be denied.

16 **III. CONCLUSION**

17 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's request to file a  
18 reply to Defendant's response to Plaintiff's objections, filed on October 24, 2017, is DENIED.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
20

21 Dated: October 27, 2017

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28