Respondents.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Case No: 2:13-cv-01784-RFB-GWF

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH TO FILE OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO

(First Request)

Petitioner Julius Bradford, by and through his attorneys of record, Assistant Federal Public Defenders Megan C. Hoffman and Jeremy C. Baron, hereby moves this Court for an extension of time of fourteen (14) days, from November 13, 2017, to and including November 27, 2017, in which to file the opposition to the respondents' motion to dismiss. This motion is based on the attached points and authorities and any pleadings and papers on file herein.

Doc. 75

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

- 1. Mr. Bradford has filed a second amended petition in this case. ECF No. 67. The respondents have filed a partial motion to dismiss the second amended petition. ECF No. 73. The current deadline for the opposition to that motion is November 13, 2017. See ECF No. 66; Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(C).
- 2. Undersigned counsel have diligently reviewed the motion to dismiss along with Mr. Bradford's file in an effort to prepare the opposition by the Court's deadline. However, counsel respectfully suggest that additional time is necessary to properly prepare Mr. Bradford's opposition to the motion to dismiss.
- 3. The partial motion to dismiss covers seven claims in Mr. Bradford's amended petition. In his opposition to the motion to dismiss, Mr. Bradford anticipates making a number of detailed arguments regarding each of these claims, potentially including an argument that he is actually innocent within the meaning of Schlup v. Delo, 513 U.S. 298 (1995), and arguments under Martinez v. Ryan, 566 U.S. 1 (2012). Because these potential arguments require detailed factual and legal discussions, the anticipated opposition is lengthy and complex. As such, additional time is necessary in order to properly prepare the opposition.
- 4. In addition to opposing the motion to dismiss, Mr. Bradford is considering whether to file a motion for leave to conduct discovery and/or for an evidentiary hearing. See ECF No. 66 (requiring that if Mr. Bradford intends to file such a motion, it accompany the opposition to the motion to dismiss). Mr. Bradford had not yet made a final decision about whether such a motion is necessary and, if it is, the precise scope of such a motion. As such, additional time is necessary to evaluate these issues.
- 5. The undersigned counsel who is taking primary drafting responsibility for the opposition has had many filing obligations in recent weeks, including, among

others, a reply brief filed on October 31, 2017, in *Gutierrez v. State*, Case No. 16-15704 (9th Cir.); an amended petition filed on November 6, 2017, in *Matlean v. Williams*, Case No. 3:16-cv-00233-HDM-VPC (D. Nev.); an opposition to a motion to dismiss filed on November 6, 2017, in *Castillo v. Baker*, Case No. 3:13-cv-00704-LRH-VPC (D. Nev.), an opposition in which the client is also asserting his actual innocence of first-degree murder; and a supplemental opening brief filed on November 9, 2017, in *LaPena v. Grigas*, Case No. 15-16154 (9th Cir.), a 40-year-old case in which the Ninth Circuit granted a certificate of appealability regarding the client's actual innocence within the meaning of *Herrera v. Collins*, 506 U.S. 390, 417 (1993), and that required extensive review of multiple multi-week trials, evidentiary hearings, trial court and appellate court pleadings, and other documents (counsel originally filed a proposed overlength brief on October 16, 2017, and filed a shortened conforming brief on November 9, 2017).

- 6. In addition, the undersigned counsel who is taking primary drafting responsibility for the opposition has many additional obligations in the coming weeks, including, among others, an amended petition due on November 16, 2017, in *Elliot v. Neven*, Case No. 3:11-cv-00041-MMD-VPC (D. Nev.); an application for a certificate of appealability due on November 17, 2017, in *Bynoe v. Baca*, Case No. 17-17012 (9th Cir.); an amended petition due on November 20, 2017, in *Burch v. Baker*, 2:17-cv-00656-MMD-VCF (D. Nev.); and a reply in support of an amended petition due on November 20, 2017, in *Gonzalez v. Williams*, Case No. 2:15-cv-00618-RFB-CWH (D. Nev.).
- 7. Therefore, counsel seek an additional fourteen (14) days, up to and including November 27, 2017, in which to file the opposition. This is undersigned counsel's first request for an extension of time to file Mr. Bradford's opposition. Undersigned counsel do not anticipate the need to take the entire fourteen days;

however, in an abundance of caution, counsel propose a deadline that postdates the Thanksgiving holiday.

- 8. On November 9, 2017, counsel contacted Chief Deputy Attorney General Heidi P. Stern and informed her of this request for an extension of time. As a matter of professional courtesy, Ms. Stern had no objection to the request. Ms. Stern's lack of objection should not be considered as a waiver of any procedural defenses or statute of limitations challenges, or construed as agreeing with the accuracy of the representations in this motion.
- 9. This motion is not filed for the purpose of delay, but in the interests of justice, as well as in the interest of Mr. Bradford. Counsel for Mr. Bradford respectfully request that this Court grant this motion and order Mr. Bradford to file the opposition to the respondents' motion to dismiss no later than November 27, 2017.

Respectfully submitted, RENE L. VALLADARES Federal Public Defender /s/Megan C. Hoffman MEGAN C. HOFFMAN Assistant Federal Public Defender /s/Jeremy C. Baron JEREMY C. BARON Assistant Federal Public Defender IT IS SO ORDERED: RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II United States District Judge DATED this 13th day of November, 2017.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 9, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court, District of Nevada by using the CM/ECF system.

Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the CM/ECF system and include: Heidi P. Stern.

I further certify that some of the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I have mailed the foregoing by First-Class Mail, postage pre-paid, or have dispatched it to a third party commercial carrier for delivery within three calendar days, to the following non-CM/ECF participants:

Julius Bradford No. 81604 Ely State Prison PO Box 1989 Ely, NV 89301

/s/ Jessica Pillsbury

An Employee of the Federal Public Defender