

1

2

3

4

5

6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

8

9 JULIUS BRADFORD,

2:13-cv-01784-RFB-GWF

10       Petitioner,

**ORDER**

11 vs.

12 TIMOTHY FILSON, *et al.*,

13       Respondents.

14 \_\_\_\_\_/

15

16       In this habeas corpus action, brought by Nevada prisoner Julius Bradford, the respondents  
17 filed a motion to dismiss on September 11, 2017 (ECF No. 73). Bradford filed an opposition to the  
18 motion to dismiss on November 27, 2017 (ECF No. 76). And, on November 27, 2017, Bradford also  
19 filed a motion for an evidentiary hearing (ECF No. 77).

20       The scheduling order governing this case was entered on January 13, 2017 (ECF No. 66).  
21 Under that order, respondents' reply in support of their motion to dismiss was due on December 27,  
22 2017, and their response to the motion for evidentiary hearing was due on the same date. *See* Order  
23 entered January 13, 2017 (ECF No. 66).

24       On December 11, 2017, respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 78),  
25 requesting an extension of time to January 10, 2018, for their response to the motion for evidentiary  
26 hearing. Then, on December 27, 2017, respondents filed another motion for extension of time (ECF

1 No. 79), requesting an extension of time to January 26, 2018, to file their reply in support of their  
2 motion to dismiss.

3 Respondents' counsel states that she needs the extensions because of her heavy caseload,  
4 because of the retirement of an attorney in her unit, and because of the holidays. This would be the  
5 first extension of these deadlines. Bradford does not oppose the motions for extension of time. The  
6 Court finds that respondents' motions for extension of time are made in good faith and not solely for  
7 the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extensions of time. The Court will,  
8 therefore, grant the extensions of time for both respondents' reply in support of their motion to  
9 dismiss and their response to the motion for evidentiary hearing.

10 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents' motions for extensions of time  
11 (ECF Nos. 78 and 79) are **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until **January 26, 2018**, to file their  
12 reply in support of their motion to dismiss, and their response to petitioner's motion for evidentiary  
13 hearing.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, in all other respects, the schedule for further  
15 proceedings set forth in the order entered January 13, 2017 (ECF No. 66) shall remain in effect.

16  
17 DATED this 28th day of December, 2017.

18  
19 

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II  
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26