1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	GARY RAY BETTENCOURT,	Case No. 1:16-cv-00150-DAD-BAM (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' ANSWER
13	v.	
14	PARKER, et al.,	(ECF No. 58)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Gary Ray Bettencourt ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in	
18	forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds on	
19	Plaintiff's claims of deliberate indifference in violation of the Eighth Amendment against	
20	Defendant Crooks for pulling two teeth that did not need to be pulled, and against Defendants	
21	Parker and Guzman for filing down six healthy teeth with a dental tool used for drilling cavities.	
22	On September 8, 2020, Defendants answered Plaintiff's complaint. (ECF No. 55.) On	
23	October 2, 2020, Plaintiff filed a response to Defendants' answer. (ECF No. 58.)	
24	In relevant part, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide that there shall be a	
25	complaint, an answer to a complaint, and, if the court orders one, a reply to an answer. Fed. R.	
26	Civ. P. 7(a). The Court has not ordered a reply to Defendants' answer and declines to make such	
27	an order.	
28	///	
		1

1	Accordingly, Plaintiff's response to Defendants' answer, filed on October 2, 2020, (ECF	
2	No. 58), is HEREBY STRICKEN from the record.	
3		
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
5	Dated: October 2, 2020 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe	
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		
27		
28		
	2	