On November 9, 2010, Plaintiff RAYMOND WATISON (Nevada Department of Corrections ID #1031835) (hereinafter, "Plaintiff") initiated the instant action by way of Complaint in the United States District Court, District of Nevada, styled: *Raymond Watison v. Mr. Joseph Hanson (HDSP Dentist)*, Case No. 2:10-cv-01340-KJD-LRL, alleging a violation of the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution, pursuant to 42 U.S.C § 1983. (Court

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Docket ("CD") #5). On December 6, 2010, the Court issued a Screening Order, permitting Plaintiff to proceed on his Eighth Amendment claim against Defendant. (CD #6). The Court ordered the Attorney General's Office to advise the Court within 21 days of the date of entry of its Order as to whether it could accept service of process for Defendant, who had not been served, and to file an Answer 30 days thereafter acceptance. Id. Acceptance of Service was made on December 21, 2010. (CD #8). As such, an Answer or other response to the Complaint is due on January 20, 2011.

II. **LEGAL ANALYSIS**

FED. R. CIV. P. 6(b) provides:

- (1) In General. When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time:
- (A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires; or
- (B) on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act because of excusable neglect.
- (2) Exceptions. A court must not extend the time to act under Rules 50(b) and (d), 52(b), 59(b), (d) and (e), and 60(b), except as those rules allow.

LR 6-1 provides:

- (a) Every motion requesting a continuance, extension of time, or order shortening time shall be "Filed" by the clerk and processed as an expedited matter. . . .
- (b) Every motion or stipulation to extend time shall inform the court of any previous extensions granted and state the reasons for the extension requested. . . . Immediately below the title of such motion or stipulation there shall be included a statement indicating whether it is the first, second, third, etc., requested extension. . . .
- (c) The court may set aside any extension obtained in contravention of this rule.
- (d) A stipulation or motion seeking to extend the time to file an opposition or final reply to a motion, or to extend the time fixed for hearing a motion, must state in its opening paragraph the filing date of the motion.

Rule 6(b)(1) allows for a party to move for an enlargement of time, the determination of which lies with the presiding court. "The Court has inherent power and discretion to control its docket, and the proceedings within the cases on its docket." Ford v. County of Missoula, Mont., 2010 WL 2674036, 1 (D. Mont., 2010) (citing Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936); see also FED. R. CIV.P. 6(b) (advisory committee note, 1946) ("Rule 6(b) is a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

27

28

///

///

rule of general application giving wide discretion to the court to enlarge these time limits or revive them after they have expired . . . ").

Defendant is requesting an extension of time to file his answer or other response to Plaintiff's Complaint (CD #5) before the deadline has expired. Defendant is making this request based upon good cause to gather key pieces of information which are necessary to effectively defend in the instant action and properly respond to Plaintiff's complaint. Since receiving Plaintiff's Complaint, the Attorney General's Office has been in contact with the named Defendant to inform him of the pending lawsuit concomitant with a request for information, including a statement of personal knowledge of the events described in the Complaint.1

Furthermore, because his counsel is scheduled for outpatient surgery during the week of February 14, 2011, Defendant respectfully requests a forty-five (45) day enlargement of time in which to file an Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint to and including March 4, 2011.

```
16
      ///
17
      ///
18
      ///
19
      ///
20
     ///
21
      ///
22
      ///
23
      ///
24
     ///
25
      ///
26
      ///
```

¹ See Affidavit of Raelene K. Palmer, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Attorney General's Office 555 E. Washington, Suite 3900

III. CONCLUSION

This Court has ordered that Defendant file his Answer or other response to Plaintiff's Complaint by Thursday, January 20, 2011. Based upon the foregoing, Defendant requests a forty-five day extension of time to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint to Friday, March 4, 2011. This request is being made in good faith and not for the purpose of delay.

DATED this 19th day of January, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO Attorney General

By: /s/ Raelene K. Palmer

RAELENE K. PALMER

Deputy Attorney General

Nevada State Bar No. 8602

Attorneys for Defendants

"IT IS SO ORDERED:

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

47 Leavis

Attorney General's Office 555 E. Washington, Suite 3900

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Office of the Attorney General and that on the 19th day of January, 2011, I served the foregoing **DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT (First Request)** by causing a true and correct copy thereof to be filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system and by causing a true and correct copy thereof to be delivered to the Department of General Services, for mailing at Las Vegas, Nevada, addressed to the following:

RAYMOND WATISON #1031835 HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON P.O. BOX 650 INDIAN SPRINGS, NEVADA 89070

/s/ Gina C. Long
An employee of the Office of the Attorney General