

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

WILLIAM THOMAS COATS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CHAUDHRI, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-02032-AWI-BAM (PC)  
ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S  
RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS’ ANSWER  
(ECF No. 79)

Plaintiff William Thomas Coats (“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 proceeds against Defendants Convalecer, Fairchild, Gladden, Gundran, and Nguyen (collectively “Defendants”) for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

On July 2, 2018, Defendants answered Plaintiff’s complaint. (ECF No. 77.) On July 16, 2018, Plaintiff filed a response to Defendants’ answer. (ECF No. 79.)

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

///

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

Accordingly, Plaintiff's response to Defendants' answer, filed on July 16, 2018, (ECF No. 79), is HEREBY STRICKEN from the record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 17, 2018

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE