## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK HUNT,	) Case No.: 1:19-cv-00504-DAD-SAB (PC)
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND REPLY TO DEFENDANTS' ANSWER
D. DIAZ, et al.,	) [ECF No. 57]
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 second reply to Defendants' answer, filed on October 19, 2020, but docketed on October 21, 2020. (ECF No. 57.)

As stated in the Court's March 26, 2020 order, 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 granted in this case, and therefore Plaintiff's second reply to the answer is STRICKEN from the record. See Fort Indep. Indian Cmty. v. California, No. CIV.S-08-432-LKK-KJM, 2008 WL 6579737, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. June 24, 2008) (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

1	automatically deemed denied or avoided under Rule 8(b)(6).").	
2		
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
4	Dated. October 22, 2020	_
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JU	DGE
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		