-RAM Adkins v. Skolnik, et al Doc. 47

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

FREDERICK W. ADKINS,	)	3:09-cv-0628-ECR (RAM)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	**MINUTES OF THE COURT**
	)	
vs.	)	May 17, 2011
	)	
MARK HERRERA,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE ROBERT A. McQUAID, JR., U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: JENNIFER COTTER REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Plaintiff has filed a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Doc. #43) and Defendant has responded to the Motion (Doc. #46). Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Doc. #43) is granted in part and denied in part as follows:

Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Doc. #43) is **GRANTED** to the extent that Plaintiff shall have thirty (30) days from the date of this order in which to file his Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Motion to Strike Order Granting Out of Time Extension.

Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Doc. #43) is **DENIED** as to Plaintiff's request for an enlargement of time to file an Opposition to Defendant's Answer to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a) provides for the filing of a complaint and an answer and various other pleadings. The Rule does not permit the filing of an opposition to an answer to a complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK
By: /s/
Deputy Clerk

Dockets.Justia.com