Martinez v. Baker et al

Doc. 60

\_

ex rel., NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; and DOES 1 through 10;

Defendants.

Defendants James Cox, Brian Sandoval, Barbara Cegavske, Adam Paul Laxalt, State of Nevada ex rel. Board of Prison Commissioners, State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Department of Corrections, by and through counsel, Adam Paul Laxalt, Nevada Attorney General, Jared M. Frost, Senior Deputy Attorney General, and Tiffany E. Breinig, Deputy Attorney General, hereby move for an extension of time to respond to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint filed June 5, 2017 (ECF No. 53). This motion is made and based on the following memorandum of points and authorities, the attached Declaration of Counsel, the pleadings and papers on file, and any other evidence the Court deems appropriate to consider.

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. Background

This is inmate civil rights case filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983. Plaintiff filed his original Complaint on June 20, 2016. ECF No. 1.

On September 12, 2016, Plaintiff filed a first-amended Complaint. ECF No. 17.

On October 26, 2016, Defendants Cox, Sandoval, Cegavske, Laxalt, State of Nevada ex rel. Board of Prison Commissioners, and State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Department of Corrections filed a motion to dismiss. ECF No. 27. On that same day, Defendants Baker, Miller, Oxborrow, Parr, Fletcher, and Byrne filed an Answer. ECF No. 28.

On October 27, 2016, the Court issued a scheduling order. ECF No. 29.

On December 16, 2016, the Court granted the parties' request for special scheduling review and issued new scheduling deadlines. ECF No. 41. Pursuant to the December 2016 order, all discovery must be completed by July 26, 2017, and any motions to amend the pleadings must be filed by April 27, 2017. *Id.* at 2-3.

On March 9, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file a second-amended Complaint. ECF No. 45.

On June 1, 2017, the Court issued a minute order granting Plaintiff's motion to file a second-amended complaint.

On June 19, 2017, Defendants Baker, Miller, Oxborrow, Parr, Fletcher, and Byrne filed an Answer to Plaintiff's second-amended complaint.

This motion for an extension of time for Defendants Cox, Sandoval, Cegavske, Laxalt, State of Nevada ex rel. Board of Prison Commissioners, and State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Department of Corrections to respond to Plaintiff's second-amended complaint follows.

## II. Applicable Law

"Unless the court orders otherwise, any required response to an amended pleading must be made within the time remaining to respond to the original pleading or within 14 days after service of the amended pleading, whichever is later. FED R. CIV. P. 15(a)(B)(3).

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A), the Court may extend the time to perform an act within a specified time for good cause shown.

## III. Argument

Defendants Cox, Sandoval, Cegavske, Laxalt, State of Nevada ex rel. Board of Prison Commissioners, and State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Department of Corrections submit that their request to extend the time to respond to Plaintiff's second-amended complaint is supported by good cause here.

Defendants Cox, Sandoval, Cegavske, Laxalt, State of Nevada ex rel. Board of Prison Commissioners, and State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Department of Corrections previously filed a motion to dismiss in response to Plaintiff's amended complaint. See ECF No. 27. In their motion, Defendants argued that Counts I and II should be dismissed because Monell claims may not be brought against states or state actors, that the entity and official-capacity Defendants should be dismissed, that the supervisory Defendants should be dismissed in their individual capacities for lack of personal participation, and that

1	Defendants Cox and Cegavske are entitled to qualified immunity. Id. However, Plaintiff	
2	has now omitted any reference to Monell in his second-amended complaint, see ECF No.	
3	53, and Defendants require additional time to determine what effect this may have on their	
4	arguments. Furthermore, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete a response due	
5	to his responsibilities to meet deadlines in other cases. See Exhibit 1 (Declaration of	
6	Counsel). Consequently, Defendants motion for an additional thirty (30) days to respond to	
7	Plaintiff's second-amended complaint should be granted.	
8	DATED this 19th day of June, 2017.	
9	9 Respectfully submitted,	
10		
11	11 Attorney General	
12	By: <u>/s/ Jared M. Frost</u> JARED M. FROST (1)	Bar No. 11132)
13	Senior Deputy Attorn TIFFANY E. BREIN	ney General IG (Bar No. 9984)
14	Deputy Attorney Ger	
15	15 Attorneys for Defende	ants
16	16	
17	17 Plaintiff has filed a notice of	
18	non-opposition. Docket No.	
19	59. For good cause shown, this motion is <b>GRANTED.</b>	
20	20 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: June 20, 2017	
21		
22	United States Magistrate Judge	
23	23	
24		
25		
	26	

27

28