

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

WILL SITTON, <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> LVMPD, et al.,	Plaintiff(s), Defendant(s).	Case No. 2:17-CV-111 JCM (VCF) <p style="text-align: center;">ORDER</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Presently before the court is plaintiff Will Sitton’s first motion to extend time to file a response to multiple outstanding motions to dismiss.¹ (ECF No. 30); see (ECF Nos. 21, 24, 28).

Also before the court is plaintiff’s second motion to extend time to file a response to multiple outstanding motions to dismiss. (ECF No. 35).

On November 15, 2017, defendants Jaqueline M. Bluth and Elissa Luzaich filed a motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 21). Also on November 15, 2017, defendants Cadet, Camp, Mechan, Neville, Rohan, Saavedra, Senior, Sloan, and Snowden filed a partial motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 24). Also on November 15, 2017, defendant David Farrara filed a motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 28). Responses to the motions were due on November 29, 2017.

On November 29, 2017, plaintiff filed his first motion to extend time to respond to defendant’s outstanding motions.² According to plaintiff’s motion, he does not have continuous

¹ While the docket report lists plaintiff’s first motion as a “Motion to Extend Time . . . to Respond re 28 Motion to Dismiss,” (ECF No. 30), the motion clearly references all three outstanding motions to dismiss. See *id.* As the plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court construes his filings liberally. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007).

² Plaintiff mailed the motion from Ely State Prison on November 27, 2017. See (ECF No. 30).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


access to a legal library (presumably due to his incarceration), a problem that has been further complicated by closings due to the holidays. Id. Given his self-representation, he submits that he has not had enough time to adequately respond to defendants' motions. Id. He requests an additional 21 days to respond to defendants' motions to dismiss. Id.

Good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to extend time (ECF No. 30) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED. Plaintiff will have an additional 21 days from the date of this order to respond to the three outstanding motions to dismiss.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's second motion to extend time (ECF No. 35) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED as moot.

DATED December 13, 2017.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE