Floyd v. Baker, et al Doc. 141

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ZANE FLOYD,	
Petitioner,	2:06-cv-0471-PMP-CWH
VS.	MINUTES OF THE COURT
RENEE BAKER, et al.,	March 18, 2014
Respondents.	
	RO, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE KKLEY REPORTER: NONE APPEARING
COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER: NO	
COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENTS:	NONE APPEARING
MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:	XXX
motion for evidentiary after the deadline	nave filed a motion to file their opposition to petitioner's e. ECF No. 139. The court finds that the motion for is the purpose of delay. In addition, respondents' counsel unsel does not oppose the motion
IT IS THEREFORE ORDER is GRANTED nunc pro tunc as of Mar	ED that respondents' motion for late filing (ECF No. 139) rch 17, 2014.
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED governed by the order entered on March	that, in all other respects, the scheduling of this matter is a 22, 2011 (ECF No. 61).
	LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK
	By: /s/ James R. Barkley Deputy Clerk