

1  
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
4

5 FERNANDO NAVARRO HERNANDEZ,

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 WILLIAM GITTERE, *et al.*,

9 Respondents.  
10

Case No. 3:09-cv-00545-LRH-CSD

ORDER GRANTING  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME  
(ECF NO. 331)

11 In this capital habeas corpus action, the Court ordered the parties to file  
12 supplemental briefing—an amended answer by Respondents, an amended reply by  
13 Petitioner Fernando Navarro Hernandez, and a response to the amended reply by  
14 Respondents—in the wake of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Shinn v. Ramirez*, 142 S.  
15 Ct. 1718 (2022). See Order entered June 28, 2022 (ECF No. 307). Respondents filed  
16 their amended answer on March 17, 2023 (ECF No. 317). Hernandez filed his amended  
17 reply on August 14, 2023 (ECF No. 322). On August 14, 2023, Hernandez also filed a  
18 motion for leave to conduct discovery (ECF No. 324), and a motion for evidentiary hearing  
19 (ECF No. 325). After a 30-day initial period, a 44-day extension of time, and a 74-day  
20 extension of time, Respondents were due to respond to Hernandez’s amended reply,  
21 motion for leave to conduct discovery, and motion for evidentiary hearing, by January 9,  
22 2024. See Order entered February 20, 2015 (ECF No 94) (30 days for response to reply;  
23 responses to motions to be filed with response to reply); Order entered September 14,  
24 2023 (ECF No. 327) (44-day extension); Order entered October 30, 2023 (ECF No. 330)  
25 (74-day extension).

26 On January 9, 2024, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No.  
27 331), requesting a further 59-day extension of time, to March 8, 2024, for their responses  
28 to Hernandez’s amended reply, motion for leave to conduct discovery, and motion for

1 evidentiary hearing. Respondents' counsel states that this extension of time is necessary  
2 because of her obligations in other cases and her administrative responsibilities at the  
3 Office of the Nevada Attorney General. Respondents' counsel states that Hernandez,  
4 who is represented by appointed counsel, does not oppose the motion for extension of  
5 time.

6 The Court finds that Respondents' motion for extension of time is made in good  
7 faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the requested  
8 extension.

9 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Respondents' Motion for Extension of Time  
10 (ECF No. 331) is **GRANTED**. Respondents will have until and including **March 8, 2024**,  
11 to file their responses to Petitioner's amended reply, motion for leave to conduct  
12 discovery, and motion for evidentiary hearing.

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, in all other respects, the schedule for further  
14 proceedings set forth in the order entered February 20, 2015 (ECF No. 94) will remain in  
15 effect.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 DATED this 12<sup>TH</sup> day of January, 2024.

18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 LARRY R. HICKS  
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28