Duda v. Neven et al

Doc. 3

Cir.), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 838 (1984). The petition on file in this action is sufficiently clear in presenting the issues that petitioner wishes to bring. The issues in this case are not complex. Counsel is not justified in this instance. Petitioner's motion for the appointment of counsel is denied.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the clerk shall FILE and ELECTRONICALLY SERVE the petition (ECF No. 1-1) upon the respondents. The clerk of court SHALL ADD attorney general Adam Paul Laxalt to the CM/ECF docket sheet as counsel for respondents.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents shall have forty-five (45) days from the entry of this order within which to answer, or otherwise respond to, the petition. In their answer or other response, respondents shall address all claims presented in the petition. Respondents shall raise all potential affirmative defenses in the initial responsive pleading, including lack of exhaustion and procedural default. Successive motions to dismiss will not be entertained. If an answer is filed, respondents shall comply with the requirements of Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Proceedings in the United States District Courts under 28 U.S.C. §2254. If an answer is filed, petitioner shall have forty-five (45) days from the date of service of the answer to file a reply.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any state court record exhibits filed by respondents shall be filed with a separate index of exhibits identifying the exhibits by number or letter. The hard copy of all state court record exhibits shall be forwarded, for this case, to the staff attorneys in the **Reno** division of the clerk of court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner's motion for the appointment of counsel (ECF No. 2) is **DENIED.** 

Dated August 23, 2016.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE