

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROBERT JOSEPH MCCARTY,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
JOHN V. ROOS, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

2:11-CV-1538 JCM (RJJ)

**ORDER**

Presently before the court is state defendants Pat Saunders and Char Hoerth’s first motion for enlargement of time. (Doc. # 106). State defendants seek a 30-day extension to file a reply to plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty’s response to their motion to dismiss. (Doc. # 106, 4:4-7).

State defendant seek the extension pursuant Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A). (Doc. # 106, 3). State defendants represent that because pro se plaintiff’s response appears to allege new constitutional violations and makes “other wild accusations,” (doc. # 106, 3:22), more time is needed to properly reply in light of counsel’s workload commitments.

Good cause appearing,


IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that state defendants’ motion for enlargement of time (doc. # 106) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED.

...  
...  
...

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

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that respondents shall have up to, and including, December 3, 2012, in which file their reply.

DATED November 5, 2012.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE