

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MANUEL MELENDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

DWIGHT NEVEN, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 2:15-cv-02076-JAD-VCF

**Order Granting Enlargement of Time**

[ECF No. 72]

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that respondents' motion for enlargement of time [ECF No. 72] is **GRANTED**. Respondents have until July 9, 2020, to answer to the remaining claims of Petitioner Manuel Melendez's Second Amended Petition.<sup>1</sup>

Melendez initiated this habeas action over four and a half years ago in October 2015.<sup>2</sup> Given the age of this case,<sup>3</sup> counsel for both parties are directed to prioritize the briefing in this case over later-filed matters. **Further extensions of time are not likely to be granted absent compelling circumstances and a strong showing of good cause why a response could not be filed within the extended time allowed despite the exercise of due diligence.**

Dated: May 29, 2020

  
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 51.

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Habeas actions are civil actions under federal practice and are subject to the reporting requirements of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 ("CJRA"), 28 U.S.C. § 471 *et seq.* The CJRA sets a three-year goal for resolution of each civil case on the merits, *id.* § 476(a)(3), and encourages "setting, at the earliest practicable time, deadlines for filing motions and a time framework for their disposition," *id.* § 473(a).