

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**

JERRY DILLINGHAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

N. EMERSON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00507-AWI-SAB (PC)

**ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS
VELASCO, MARTINEZ, LOFTIN,
EMERSON, MARSH, WESCOAT, AND
WILSON TO FILE A RESPONSIVE
PLEADING TO PLAINTIFF'S SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

(ECF No. 66)

FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE

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

On August 19, 2019, Defendants Velasco, Martinez, Loftin, Emerson, Marsh, Wescoat, and Wilson filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim on the ground that they are entitled to qualified immunity. (ECF No. 54.)

On February 20, 2020, the assigned District Judge denied Defendants' motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 66.)

Defendants' responsive pleading to Plaintiff's second amended complaint was due on or before March 5, 2020. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(4)(A) (stating that the "responsive pleading must be served within 14 days after notice of the court's" denial of a Rule 12(b) motion). However, Defendants have not filed a responsive pleading to Plaintiff's second amended complaint, filed a

1 request for an extension of time to do so, or otherwise communicated with the Court.

2 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that, within **fourteen (14) days** from the date of
3 service of this order, Defendants shall file a responsive pleading to Plaintiff's second amended
4 complaint, (ECF No. 43).

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: **March 10, 2020**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28