1

2

4

5 6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

17

16

18 19

2122

23

20

24

2526

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RANDOLPH L. MOORE,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM GITTERE, et al.,

Respondents.

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

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME (ECF NO. 65)

In this capital habeas corpus action, the petitioner, Randolph L. Moore, filed a second amended habeas petition on July 15, 2019 (ECF No. 59). After a 32-day extension of time, Respondents' respond to the second amended petition was due October 15, 2019. See Order entered February 5, 2019 (ECF No. 51); Order entered September 10, 2019 (ECF No. 64).

On October 9, 2019, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 65), requesting a second extension of time, this one 62 days, to December 16, 2019, to respond to Moore's second amended petition. Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time is necessary because of the complexity of this case and his obligations in other cases. Moore does not oppose the motion for extension of time.

The Court finds that Respondents' motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension of time requested.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 65) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until and including **December 16, 2019**, to respond to the petitioner's second amended habeas petition.

///

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in all other respects, the schedule for further proceedings set forth in the order entered February 5, 2019 (ECF No. 51) will remain in effect. DATED October 18, 2019. Cellus C. Mahan JAMES C. MAHAN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE