

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,)	
v.)	ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S SECOND REPLY TO DEFENDANTS’ ANSWER
C. OGBUEHI, et al.)	[ECF No. 70]
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 second reply to Defendants’ answer to the complaint. (ECF No. 70.)

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.¹

///
///
///

¹ 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).

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 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: June 3, 2020


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE