I

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
8	
9	MARK ROGERS,
10	Petitioner, 3:02-cv-00342-GMN-VPC
11	vs. ORDER
12	TIMOTHY FILSON, et al.,
13	Respondents.
14	/
15	
16	In this capital habeas corpus action, the respondents filed an answer on May 8, 2017 (ECF
17	
18	Rogers filed a motion for an evidentiary hearing on June 7, 2017 (ECF No. 204), and that motion is
19 20	now fully briefed (ECF Nos. 207, 209).
20 21	On July 7, 2017, respondents filed a Motion to Amend Order (ECF No. 210), in which they essentially request leave of court to file a response to Rogers' reply. On July 7, 2017, respondents
21	also filed a Motion for Leave to Supplement (ECF No. 211), requesting leave to file a supplement to
22	their answer. Respondents filed the proposed supplement to their answer on July 7, 2017, as well
23	(ECF No. 212). Respondents explain that they wish to file the response to Rogers' reply in order to
24 25	respond to legal argument and citations presented for the first time in the reply, and they explain that
23 26	they wish to file the supplement to their answer in order to present argument based on the recent
	and the the die supprement to their unswer in order to present argument bused on the recent

1	Supreme Court decision in Davila v. Davis, 2017 WL 2722418 (June 26, 2017). Good cause
2	appearing,
3	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that respondents' Motion to Amend Order (ECF No. 210)
4	is GRANTED. Respondents will have 30 days from the date of this order to file a response to
5	petitioner's reply. The Court will not be inclined to extend this deadline.
6	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents' Motion for Leave to Supplement
7	Respondents' Answer with New Authority (ECF No. 211) is GRANTED. As respondents have
8	already filed the supplement to their answer (ECF No. 212), no further action is required in this
9	regard.
10	
11	Dated this 10 day of July, 2017.
12	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 25	
26	
	2