

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 CHRISTOPHER LENARD BLOCKSON,

5 Petitioner,

6 v.

7 JERRY HOWELL, *et al.*,

8 Respondents.
9

Case No. 2:21-cv-00731-GMN-VCF

10
11 **ORDER**

12 In this habeas corpus action, brought *pro se* by Christopher Lenard Blockson,
13 the respondents filed a motion to dismiss on February 4, 2022 (ECF No. 35). Blockson
14 filed an opposition to the motion to dismiss on February 18, 2022 (ECF No. 45). After a
15 30-day initial period and a 45-day extension of time, Respondents were to file a reply to
16 Blockson's opposition to their motion by May 5, 2022. See Order entered July 8, 2021
17 (ECF No. 8) (30 days for reply); Order entered March 22, 2022 (ECF No. 49) (45-day
18 extension).

19 On May 5, 2022, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF
20 No. 52), requesting a further 46-day extension of time, to June 20, 2022. Respondents'
21 counsel states that the extension of time is necessary because of her obligations in
22 other cases. The Court finds that the motion for extension of time is made in good faith
23 and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension,
24 and the Court will grant the motion. However, the Court has examined Respondents'
25 motion to dismiss and Blockson's response and determines that Respondents will have
26 had more than enough time (about four months) to file their reply, despite counsel's
27 heavy caseload. *The Court will not grant any further motion to extend this deadline*
28 *absent extraordinary circumstances.*

1 On March 25, 2022, Blockson filed a document entitled "Official Justice Court
2 Records Not Provided by the Attorney General" (ECF No. 50). In that document,
3 Blockson asserts that Respondents failed to provide the Court with certain material from
4 the state court record, and he includes that material as exhibits. The Court treats
5 Blockson's March 25 filing as a motion to expand the record under Rule 7 of the Rules
6 Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. Respondents filed a
7 response to Blockson's motion on April 7, 2022 (ECF No. 51), showing that they have in
8 fact filed copies of the material in question (as part of their Exhibit 3, at ECF No. 36-3).
9 Therefore, the Court will deny Blockson's motion, as it is unnecessary to expand the
10 record as he suggests.

11 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of
12 Time (ECF No. 52) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until and including
13 **June 20, 2022**, to file a reply in support of their motion to dismiss.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, in all other respects, the schedule for further
15 proceedings set forth in the order entered July 8, 2021 (ECF No. 8) will remain in effect.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Petitioner's filing entitled "Official Justice Court
17 Records Not Provided by the Attorney General" (ECF No. 50) is treated as a motion to
18 expand the record and is **DENIED**.

19
20 DATED THIS 9 day of May, 2022.

21
22 
23 _____
24 GLORIA M. NAVARRO
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28