1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 CURTIS RENEE JACKSON, 11 Case No.: 1:14-cv-00222-SAB (PC) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' ANSWER 13 v. [ECF No. 22] 14 DYE, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 Plaintiff Curtis Renee Jackson is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights 17 action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 18 This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's second amended complaint against Defendants Dye and 19 20 Mills for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need. Defendants filed an answer to the amended 21 complaint on February 12, 2015. On March 30, 2015, Plaintiff filed a response to Defendants' answer. (ECF No. 22.) 22 23 Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides as follows: 24 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 25 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 26 pleading shall be allowed, except that the court may order a reply to an answer or a third-party answer. 27

28

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	IT IS SO ORDERED.	SIP
5	Dated: March 31, 2015	July N. Lave
6		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		