

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**

WILLIAM MISIEWICZ,

*Plaintiff,*

vs.

STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*

*Defendants.*

2:13-cv-01419-MMD-VCF

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that defendants' motion (#32) to screen the amended complaint and motion (#33) to extend their time to answer both are DENIED as unnecessary. The Court does not need, or want, prompting by motion to screen matters that it screens as a matter of course. Nor do defendants need an extension of time to answer in this type of case prior to an express directive that they do so. Counsel might consider in future instead filing a motion to withdraw an answer as improvidently filed in the circumstance presented by their inadvertent answer on May 14, 2014. The Court will disregard the answer and will screen the amended complaint as promptly as its docket allows.

DATED: June 3, 2014

CAM FERENBACH  
United States Magistrate Judge