

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NORMAN IVORY,

Plaintiff,

v.

R. MIRANDA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:12-cv-2902 WBS AC P

ORDER

Defendant Miranda filed an answer to plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment claim, the remaining claim of the first amended complaint. See ECF Nos. 33, 34. Thereafter, plaintiff filed what he termed a “response” to the answer. ECF No. 36. Defendant Miranda has moved to strike that response. ECF No. 37.

Rule 7(a)((7) permits a reply to an answer “if the court orders one ...” This court has not ordered a reply to the answer and does not find one to be necessary or appropriate in this instance.

Accordingly IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant’s motion to strike plaintiff’s reply to the answer (ECF No. 37) is granted.

DATED: July 1, 2014



ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE