Prentice v. Barrett	et al Doc. 1	9
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
7	ANTHONY PRENTICE,)	
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v. 2:16-cv-01390-APG-GWF	
10	REGINA BARRETT et al., ORDER	
11	Defendants.)	
12		
13	I. DISCUSSION	
14	On March 2, 2017, this Court issued a screening order permitting portions of Counts	
15	I, II, III, and IV to proceed against Defendant Horsley among others. (ECF No. 9 at 9). On	
16	March 30, 2017, Defendants filed a motion for clarification stating that they seek clarification	
17	as to which Horsley Plaintiff was referring to in his complaint because Defendants found two	
18	individuals with that name in their records. (ECF No. 12 at 2). On April 7, 2017, Plaintiff	
19	responded that his intended Defendant Horsley was the individual employed as a correctional	
20	officer at Ely State Prison. (ECF No. 17 at 1). On April 14, 2017, Defendants filed a reply	
21	seeking an order identifying Defendant Horsley as the individual employed as a correctional	
22	officer at Ely State Prison. (ECF No. 18 at 2).	
23	Pursuant to Plaintiff's clarification, Defendant Horsley is the individual employed as a	
24	correctional officer at Ely State Prison.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

CONCLUSION II. For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that the motion for clarification (ECF No. 12) is denied as moot. DATED: This 17th day of April, 2017.