

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA**

CHRISTOPHER ZIMMERMAN,)	CASE NO. 4:12CV3246
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
STATE OF NEBRASKA,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

This matter is before the court on Petitioner’s Motion for Extension of Time (Filing No. [24](#)) and Respondent’s Objection to Petitioner’s Motion (Filing No. [25](#)). Petitioner requests a second 90-day extension of time to respond to Respondent’s Brief. (Filing No. [24](#); see *a/so* Filing Nos. [22](#) and 23.) Petitioner argues that he needs the extra time to get “information and statements from people involved to back the claims” he filed. (*Id.*) Respondent objects to the extension, arguing that Petitioner’s Petition is time barred and that providing Petitioner with more time to respond is unnecessary. (Filing No. [25](#).) The court agrees with Respondent; a 90-day extension of time under these circumstances is unnecessary. Nevertheless, the court will provide Petitioner with a reasonable extension of time. Accordingly,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner’s Motion for Extension of Time (Filing No. [24](#)) is granted in part. Petitioner shall file his response brief by March 7, 2014; and

2. Respondent's Objection (Filing No. [25](#)) is granted in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 24th day of January, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp
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.