

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

STEVEN M. JACOB,	)	4:10CV3073
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>MEMORANDUM</b>
	)	<b>AND ORDER</b>
ROBERT HOUSTON,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

This matter is before the court on Petitioner’s Motion to Stay (filing no. [32](#)) and Motion for Extension of Time (filing no. [33](#)). For the reasons discussed below, Petitioner’s Motion to Stay is denied and his Motion for Extension of Time is granted.

*I. Motion to Stay*

On December 12, 2010, Petitioner filed a Motion to Stay. (Filing No. [32](#).) In this Motion, Petitioner asks the court to order the District Court of Lancaster County, Nebraska, to stay proceedings in a pending state court civil suit brought against him by Margaret Schlichtman, Special Administrator for the Estate of Melody J. Hopper. (*Id.* at CM/ECF pp. 4, 6.)

“Federal courts cannot enjoin state-court proceedings unless the intervention is authorized expressly by federal statute or falls under one of two other exceptions to the Anti-Injunction Act.” *McFarland v. Scott*, 512 U.S. 849, 857 (1994). Pursuant to the federal habeas corpus statute, a federal judge, “before whom a habeas corpus proceeding is pending, may . . . stay any proceeding against the person detained in any State court or by or under the authority of any State for any matter involved in the habeas corpus proceeding.” [28 U.S.C. § 2251](#).

The court has carefully reviewed Petitioner's Motion and finds Petitioner has failed to argue or demonstrate that intervention is authorized by [28 U.S.C. § 2251](#) or an exception to the Anti-Injunction Act. Accordingly, Petitioner's Motion to Stay is denied.

## *II. Motion for Extension of Time*

Also pending is Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time to File a Reply to Respondent's Answer. (Filing No. [33](#).) In this Motion, Petitioner states that he has been sick and unable to work on a Reply. (*Id.*) Petitioner asks the court to extend the time in which he can reply to Respondent's answer to January 10, 2011. (*Id.*) For good cause shown, Petitioner's Motion is granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner's Motion to Stay (filing no. [32](#)) is denied.
2. Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time (filing no. [33](#)) is granted. Petitioner's reply is due January 10, 2011.

DATED this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon  
Chief United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.