

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

TRAVIS CLINTON HITTSON,

Petitioner

vs.

CARL HUMPHREY, Warden,

Respondent

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 5:01-CV-384 (MTT)

---

**ORDER**

In an Order dated June 30, 2011, the Court ordered Hittson to “amend his original 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition to include the now-exhausted *Brady* claim or to notify the Court why he cannot so amend.” (Doc. 42 ). In response to this Order, Hittson filed an Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody (hereinafter “Amended Petition”). (Doc. 44).

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that, pursuant to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts (hereinafter “Rule 5”), Respondent file an answer in writing to the allegations of Hittson’s Amended Petition. This answer is to be filed with the Clerk of this Court within thirty days of the entry of this Order.

The answer is to include all records that are required by Rule 5 that were not previously included in the Respondent’s Notice of Filing, which was filed in this Court on March 22, 2002. (Doc. 8). This various courts required by Rule 5 (d) that are related to Hittson’s exhaustion of his claim brought pursuant to *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963).

Hittson may, pursuant to Rule 5(e), file a reply to the Respondent's answer within fifteen days of the date shown on Respondent's answer.

**SO ORDERED**, this 18th day of July, 2011.

S/Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT