| 1 | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 7 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | PETER J. MUNOZ, JR., | |
| 10 | Petitioner, | Case No. 3:11-cv-00197-LRH-RAM |
| 11 | VS. | <u>ORDER</u> |
| 12 | GREGORY SMITH, WARDEN, et al., | |
| 13 | Respondents. | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | Petitioner has filed a first amended petition (#69). The court has reviewed it pursuant to | |
| 16 | Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. The court | |
| 17 | will direct respondents to file a response. | |
| 18 | IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that respondents shall have forty-five (45) days from the | |
| 19 | date of entry of this order to answer or otherwise respond to the amended petition (#69). | |
| 20 | Respondents shall raise all potential affirmative defenses in the initial responsive pleading, | |
| 21 | including lack of exhaustion and procedural default. Successive motions to dismiss will not be | |
| 22 | entertained. If respondents file and serve an answer, then they shall comply with Rule 5 of the | |
| 23 | Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and then petitioner shall | |
| 24 | have forty-five (45) days from the date on which the answer is served to file a reply. | |
| 25 | DATED this 2nd day of June, 2015. | 1.1. |
| 26 | | Flank |
| 27 | | LARRY R. HICKS |
| 28 | | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
| | | |