

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**

RAYMOND ALFORD BRADFORD,	)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-01128-SAB (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S REPLY TO
v.	)	DEFENDANTS’ ANSWER
	)	
C. OGBUEHI, et al.	)	[ECF No. 67]
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Raymond Alford Bradford is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On May 19, 2020, Plaintiff filed a reply to Defendants’ answer to the complaint. (ECF No. 67.)

The Court has not ordered any reply to Defendants’ answer in this case. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7 lists all pleadings that are permitted, including “if the court orders one, a reply to an answer.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a)(7) (emphasis added). No request to file a reply to the answer was sought or granted in this case, and therefore Plaintiff’s reply must be stricken.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s reply to Defendants’ answer to the complaint, filed on May 19, 2020 (ECF No. 67) is **HEREBY STRICKEN** from the record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:     **May 20, 2020**    

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> A plaintiff rarely needs to file any reply to an answer, “because the allegations in pleadings not requiring a response—e.g., the answer—are already automatically deemed denied or avoided under Rule 8(b)(6).” Fort Indep. Indian Cmty. v. California, No. CIV.S-08-432-LKK-KJM, 2008 WL 6579737, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. June 24, 2008).