

1

2

3

4

5

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

7

8 DEBARON SANDERS,

9 Petitioner,

2:14-cv-01966-JCM-NJK

10 vs.

ORDER11 BRIAN WILLIAMS, SR., *et al.*,

12 Respondents.

13 _____/

14

15 In this habeas corpus action, brought by Nevada prisoner Debaron Sanders, the respondents
16 were due to file a response to Sanders' habeas petition on November 2, 2015. *See* Order entered
17 September 17, 2015 (ECF No. 10). Respondents did not file a response by that date.

18 On November 10, 2015, respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 11),
19 requesting that the time for their response be extended by 45 days, to December 17, 2015.
20 Respondents' counsel states that respondents missed the due date for the filing of the response to the
21 petition because of a calendaring error.

22 The court finds that respondents have shown excusable neglect. *See* LR 6-1(b). The court
23 finds, further, that respondents' motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for
24 the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension of time respondents request.


25 ///

26 ///

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time
2 *Nunc Pro Tunc* (ECF No. 11) is **GRANTED**. Respondents shall have until and including
3 **December 17, 2015**, to answer or otherwise respond to the habeas corpus petition. If respondents
4 file an answer, petitioner shall then have 45 days to file a reply. If respondents file a motion to
5 dismiss, petitioner shall then have 45 days to file a response to the motion to dismiss, and then
6 respondents shall have 20 days to file a reply in support of that motion.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Dated November 18, 2015.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE