

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

THOMAS K. MILLS,
Plaintiff,
v.
ZACHERY JONES, et al.
Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-01214-JLT-SAB (PC)
ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S REPLY
TO ANSWER
(ECF No. 65)

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On June 4, 2024, Plaintiff filed a reply to Defendants’ filed which was filed on March 11, 2024.

Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides as follows:
There shall be a complaint and an answer; a reply to a counterclaim denominated as such; an answer to a cross-claim, if the answer contains a cross-claim; a third-party complaint, if a person who was not an original party is summoned under the provisions of Rule 14; and a third-party answer, if a third-party complaint is served. No other pleading shall be allowed, except that the court may order a reply to an answer or a third-party answer.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a).

Here, the Court did not order Plaintiff to reply to Defendants’ answer, nor did Plaintiff seek any leave to file a reply to the answer. The Court declines to require any reply to the answer.

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, filed on June 4, 2024, is stricken from the record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 5, 2024



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE