

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

VICTOR TAGLE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF NEVADA, NDOC, NDOC'S
EMPLOYEES, et al.,

Defendants.

2:15-cv-01402-JAD-VCF

ORDER

MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO RESPOND
[ECF No. 187]

12 Before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Enlargement of Time to Respond to Plaintiff's Filings
13 at ECF Nos. 182, 183, and 184. (ECF No. 187). For the reasons discussed below, the motion is granted.

14 Responses to Plaintiff's filings were due on October 15, 2018. On that date, Defendants filed a
15 motion for enlargement of time. (ECF No. 187). Defendants ask for a one-week extension to file their
16 responses. (Id. at 2-3).

17 "When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend
18 the time." Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1); see also LR IA 6-1. "Good cause exists to enlarge the time by which
19 a party may file a brief where additional time is needed to prepare such a brief." *Olivas v. Nevada ex rel.*
20 *Dep't of Corr.*, No. 2:14-cv-01801-JCM-VCF, 2017 WL 3484650, at *1 (D. Nev. Aug. 14, 2017).

21 The Court finds good cause to extend the time for Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's motions.¹
22 Plaintiff has filed several motions within a short amount of time, explaining Defendants' request for a
23 minor extension of time to respond.

24
25

¹ The Court is ruling on the motion for extension of time before the time to respond to the motion has expired. Defendants are asking for a one-week extension, whereas the deadline to respond to the motion to extend time is two weeks.

