Holden v. Nevins et al Doc. 70

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

23

26

27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JIM BASS HOLDEN, Case No. 2:13-cv-00668-JCM-GWF **ORDER**

Petitioner.

WARDEN DWIGHT NEVINS, et al.,

v.

Respondents.

Before the court are petitioner's motion for extension of time (ECF No. 66), respondents'

opposition (ECF No. 68), and petitioner's reply (ECF No. 69). Petitioner, represented by new

counsel, asks for time to late-file a reply to the answer (ECF No. 47). The court appointed current

counsel to represent petitioner because prior counsel, William Gamage, abandoned petitioner.

According to current counsel, Gamage had a mental lapse in 2016, abandoned his clients, and has

disappeared. This was about the time that petitioner's reply to the answer (ECF No. 47) was due.

Petitioner has shown good cause for an extension.

In the reply to the motion (ECF No. 69), petitioner also states an intention to file a motion

for leave to file a second amended petition, because Gamage's first amended petition dropped all

of petitioner's claims and replaced them with only one claim. The court will set a time limit for

petitioner to file that motion, because if the court grants that motion, then the filing of the reply

28 will be moot.

IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that petitioner's motion for extension of time (ECF No. 66) is **GRANTED**. Petitioner will have ninety (90) days from the date of entry of this order to file a reply to the answer (ECF No. 47).

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that if petitioner wishes to file a motion for leave to file a second amended petition, then petitioner must file that motion within forty-five (45) days from the date of entry of this order.

DATED: September 27, 2018.

AMES C. MAHAN United States District Judge