

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
5

6 RANDOLPH L. MOORE,

7 Petitioner,

8 v.

9 WILLIAM GITTERE, *et al.*,

10 Respondents.
11

Case No. 2:13-cv-0655-JCM-DJA

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
(ECF NO. 115)

12
13 In this capital habeas corpus action, the respondents filed a motion to dismiss
14 (ECF No. 71) on April 2, 2020. The petitioner, Randolph L. Moore, was due to respond
15 to that motion by June 1, 2020. See Order entered February 5, 2019 (ECF No. 51) (60
16 days for response).

17 On June 1, 2020, Moore filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 115),
18 requesting a 60-day extension of time, to July 31, 2020, to respond to the motion to
19 dismiss. Moore's counsel states that the extension of time is necessary because of the
20 complexity of this case and because of his obligations in other cases. This would be the
21 first extension of this deadline. Respondents do not oppose the motion for extension of
22 time.

23 The Court finds that Moore's motion for extension of time is made in good faith
24 and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for an extension of
25 time.

26 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time
27 (ECF No. 115) is **GRANTED**. Petitioner will have until and including **July 31, 2020**, to
28 respond to the motion to dismiss.

