(PC) Little v. Marciano et al		
1		
2		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	DEMETRIC LITTLE,	
11	Plaintiff,	No. CIV S-10-2490 JAM DAD P
12	VS.	
13	P. A. C. MARCIANO, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	<u>ORDER</u>
15	/	
16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action for relief	
17	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 4, 2011, plaintiff filed a response to defendants' answer	
18	to plaintiff's complaint. Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides as follows:	
19	There shall be a complaint and an answer; a reply to a counterclaim	
20	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	
21	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	
22	allowed, except that the court may order a reply to an answer or a third- party answer.	
23	Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a) (emphasis added). The court has not ordered plaintiff to reply to defendants'	
24	answer and declines to make such an order.	
25		
26	5 /////	
		1

Doc. 17

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's May 4, 2011 response to defendants' answer to plaintiff's complaint shall be disregarded.

DATED: May 18, 2011.

Dale A. Dage DALE A. DROZD

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:12 litt2490.77e