

1 staying this case. Instead, for good cause shown, the Court will grant Respondent a further
2 extension of time to respond to Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A); *See*
3 *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (instructing federal courts to liberally construe
4 the “inartful pleading[s] of pro se litigants.”).

5 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

- 6 1. Petitioner’s Motion to Stay (Doc. No. 35) is DENIED, as unnecessary.
- 7 2. Petitioner shall deliver a response to Respondent’s Motion to dismiss to correctional
8 officials for mailing **no later than May 21, 2025**.

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

Dated: March 6, 2025


HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE