

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**

MARK HUNT,)	Case No.: 1:19-cv-00504-DAD-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S REPLY TO
v.)	DEFENDANTS’ ANSWER
)	
D. DIAZ, et al.,)	[ECF No. 35]
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Mark Hunt is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff’s reply to Defendants’ answer, filed on March 24, 2020, but docketed on March 25, 2020. (ECF No. 35.)

On March 23, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to file a reply to Defendants’ answer. (ECF No. 33.)

On March 24, 2012, the undersigned signed an order denying Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time to file a reply because it was not previously ordered or granted in this case; however, the order was not docketed until March 25, 2012-after Plaintiff’s reply was docketed in this case. (ECF No. 34.)

///

As stated in the Court’s March 25, 2012 order, the Court has not ordered any reply to Defendants’

1 answer in this case. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7 lists all pleadings that are permitted, including
2 “if the court orders one, a reply to an answer.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a)(7) (emphasis added). No request to
3 file a reply to the answer was granted in this case, and therefore Plaintiff’s reply to the answer is
4 STRICKEN from the record. See Fort Indep. Indian Cmty. v. California, No. CIV.S-08-432-LKK-KJM,
5 2008 WL 6579737, at *1 (E.D. Cal. June 24, 2008) (A plaintiff rarely needs to file any reply to an
6 answer, “because the allegations in pleadings not requiring a response—e.g., the answer—are already
7 automatically deemed denied or avoided under Rule 8(b)(6).”).

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: March 26, 2020



11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE