1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 LACEDRIC JOHNSON, Case No. 1:14-cv-01601-LJO-SKO (PC) 11 Plaintiff, ORDER STRIKING REPLY TO ANSWER 12 (Doc. 24) v. 13 SCOTT FRAUENHEIM, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 Plaintiff Lacedric Johnson, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed 16 this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 14, 2014. 17 proceeding on Plaintiff's amended complaint against (1) Defendants Santos and Salas for violation 18 of the First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause; (2) Defendant Santos for violation of the Fourth 19 Amendment; (3) Defendants Santos, Leon, Espinosa, Benavides, Bejinez, Erickson, Hill, 20 Kennedy, Lopez, Luna, Ramirez, Salas, Trinidad, Deshazo, and Newton for violation of the Eighth 21 Amendment arising out of the use of excessive physical force; and (4) Defendant Bejinez, 22 Trinidad, Deshazo, George, Hansen, Liebold, Sharp, and Hoggard for violation of the Eighth 23 Amendment arising out of the denial of adequate medical care. 24 On October 28, 2015, Plaintiff filed a second reply to Defendants' answer. Neither the 25 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Local Rules provide for a reply to an answer, absent an 26 order from the Court requiring one, and in this case, the Court did not order one. Fed. R. Civ. P. 27 7(a)(7). 28

1	Accordingly, Plaintiff's reply is HEREBY ORDERED STRICKEN from the record. 1
2	
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: October 29, 2015 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	On October 26, 2015, the Court issued an order striking Plaintiff's unsigned reply filed on October 23, 2015. (Docs.
28	22, 23.) Plaintiff was advised not to refile the answer but he did not yet have the benefit of that order when he filed the second reply. (Doc. 23.)