

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 * * *

5 WILLIAM P. CASTILLO,

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 WILLIAM GITTERE, *et al.*,

9 Respondents.
10
11

Case No. 2:04-cv-00868-RCJ-EJY

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME (ECF NO. 266)**

12
13 In this capital habeas corpus action, on May 25, 2021, the petitioner, William P.
14 Castillo, represented by appointed counsel, filed his opening brief on remand (ECF No.
15 255). After a 60-day initial period, a 62-day extension, three 60-day extensions, and a
16 45-day extension, Respondents were due to file their responding brief on May 9, 2022.
17 See Order entered January 25, 2021 (ECF No. 252) (initial 60-day period for responding
18 brief); Order entered September 8, 2021 (ECF No. 257) (60-day extension); Order
19 entered October 21, 2021 (ECF No. 259) (60-day extension); Order entered December
20 28, 2021 (ECF No. 261) (62-day extension); Order entered January 24, 2022 (ECF No.
21 263) (60-day extension); Order entered March 25, 2022 (ECF No. 265) (45-day
22 extension).

23 On May 9, 2022, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No.
24 266), requesting a further 45-day extension of time, to June 23, 2022, to file their
25 responding brief on remand. Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time is
26 necessary because of her obligations in other cases and other professional
27 responsibilities, and because of personal health issues. Petitioner does not oppose the
28 motion for extension of time. The Court finds that the motion for extension of time is

1 made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and there is good cause for
2 the extension of time.


3 However, Respondents will now have had over a year since Castillo filed his brief
4 on remand to file their responding brief. *The Court will not look favorably upon any*
5 *further motion to extend this deadline.*

6 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of
7 Time (ECF No. 266) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until and including
8 June 23, 2022, to file their responding brief on remand.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Court will sua sponte extend the time for
10 Petitioner to file his reply brief to 90 days after Respondents file their responding brief.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
12 25(d), William Reubart is substituted for William Gittere as the respondent warden, and
13 Aaron D. Ford is substituted for Adam Paul Laxalt, as the respondent Nevada Attorney
14 General. The Clerk of the Court is directed to update the docket to reflect these
15 changes.

16
17 DATED THIS 9th day of May, 2022.

18
19 
20 _____
21 ROBERT C. JONES
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28