

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 09-cv-02085-CMA-MJW

RANDAL ANKENEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. TIM CREANY,  
NURSE PRACTITIONER KLENKE, and  
NURSE PRACTITIONER HIBBS,

Defendant.

---

MINUTE ORDER

---

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Request for Extension of Time to File Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (**Docket No. 117**) is **granted**, and plaintiff shall have up to and including April 25, 2011, to file a reply in support of his Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 86). It is further

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Request for Extension of Time to File Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (**Docket No. 118**) is **granted**, and plaintiff shall have up to and including April 25, 2011, to file his reply in support of his Motion to Amend (Docket No. 87). It is further

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Request for Extension of Time to File Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Costs of Depositions (**Docket No. 119**) is **granted**, and plaintiff shall have up to and including April 25, 2011, to file his reply in support of his Motion for Costs (Docket No. 88). It is further

**ORDERED** that plaintiff's Motion for Hearing to Establish Facts Pursuant to Rule 56(d)(2) (**Docket No. 99**) is **denied**. The court does not find it necessary to "interrogate" the attorneys in this case in order to determine what material facts are not genuinely at issue in this case. In addition, plaintiff seeks this hearing to narrow the issues, but the court has already narrowed the issues in this case. (See Docket No. 41 at 11; Judge Arguello's Order of May 19, 2010). It is further

**ORDERED** that the plaintiff's Motion for Physical Examination (**Docket No. 101**) is **denied** for the reasons stated in the defendants' response (Docket No. 114). It is further

**ORDERED** that plaintiff's Second Motion for Court Appointed Expert (**Docket No. 105**) is **denied**, substantially for the reasons stated in the defendants' response (Docket No. 116). While medical issues are involved in this case, this case is not overly complex, only one issue remains in this case, and the court finds that a court-appointed expert is not necessary.

Date: April 12, 2011

---