1		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT CO	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
4 CLAY MERRITT BURGON, Case No. 2:14	-cv-01128-RFB-CWH	
Order Grantir	g Motion for Extension of o. 82)	
7		
8 BRIAN WILLIAMS, SR., et al.,		
9 Respondents.		
10		
In this habeas corpus case, Respondents filed an answer on December 3, 2018		
(ECF No. 73), and the petitioner, Clay Merritt Burgon, filed a reply on April 17, 2019		
(ECF No. 79). Respondents' response to the reply was due on May 17, 2019. See Order entered		
May 15, 2017 (ECF No. 42).		
On May 14, 2019, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 82),		
requesting a 45-day extension of time, to July 1, 2019, to file their response to Burgon's reply.		
Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time is necessary because of her obligations in		
other cases and because she only recently was assigned this case. Petitioner 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.		
22 The Court will grant the motion for extension of time.	The Court will grant the motion for extension of time.	
However, the Court will not look favorably upon an	y motion to further extend this	
24 deadline.		
25 ///		
26 ///		
27 ///		
28 ///		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	DISTRICT OF NEVADA CLAY MERRITT BURGON, Petitioner, v. BRIAN WILLIAMS, SR., et al., Respondents. In this habeas corpus case, Respondents filed an answer (ECF No. 73), and the petitioner, Clay Merritt Burgon, filed a re (ECF No. 79). Respondents' response to the reply was due on May 15, 2017 (ECF No. 42). On May 14, 2019, Respondents filed a motion for e requesting a 45-day extension of time, to July 1, 2019, to file Respondents' counsel states that the extension of time is necess other cases and because she only recently was assigned this case motion for extension of time. The Court finds that Respondents' motion for extension not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for The Court will grant the motion for extension of time. However, the Court will not look favorably upon and deadline. /// ///	

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time
2	(ECF No. 82) is GRANTED . Respondents will have until and including July 1, 2019 , to file their
3	response to the petitioner's reply.
4	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in all other respects, the schedule for further
5	proceedings set forth in the order entered October 25, 2017 (ECF No. 21) will remain in effect.
6	
7	DATED this <u>15th</u> day of May, 2019.
8	
9	R
10	RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JODGE
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2