Hutchins v. Nevada NDOC et al Doc. 85

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TYRONE HUTCHINS,	)	3:10-cv-00369-LRH-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	**MINUTES OF THE COURT**
	)	
vs.	)	July 3, 2013
	)	
NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, et. al.	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is Plaintiff's motion for enlargement of time. (Doc. # 84.) In his motion, Plaintiff makes reference to an extension of time to: (1) respond to Defendants' opposition to his motion for appointment of counsel and (2) file an opposition to Defendants' reply filed in support of their motion for summary judgment.

First, to the extent Plaintiff seeks an extension of time to file an opposition to Defendants' reply filed in support of their motion for summary judgment, Plaintiff's request is **DENIED**. The local rules contemplate the filing of a motion as well as opposition and reply briefs. *See* Local Rule 7-2. The filing of a sur-reply is not permitted. *Id.* Nor has Plaintiff set forth good cause justifying leave of court to file an additional brief.

Next, as to Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to file his reply brief in support of his motion for appointment of counsel, Plaintiff's request is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff has up to and including **July 19, 2013**, to file his reply brief in support of his motion for appointment of counsel.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

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

Dockets.Justia.com