1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	LAVAR GARY VARNADO,)
9	Petitioner,) 3:11-cv-00325-RCJ-VPC
10	VS.)) ORDER
11	STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,))
12	Respondents.) /
13		
14	This is a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in which petitioner, a	
15	state prisoner, is proceeding pro se. On August 4, 2011, respondents filed a motion to dismiss the	
16	petition. (ECF No. 12.) In response, petitioner filed a motion to strike the motion to dismiss as	
17	procedurally improper and requested that the court rule on the motion to strike before requiring him to	
18	oppose the motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 14.)	
19	Petitioner argues that respondents' motion to dismiss is not properly before the court because the	
20	court ordered respondents to file an answer and prohibited motions to dismiss. Petitioner is incorrect.	
21	The court authorized respondents to file an answer or "other response" to the petition. (ECF No. 5.)	
22	In the Ninth Circuit, the filing of a motion to dismiss is expressly authorized by Habeas Rule 4. Habeas	
23	Rule 4 Advisory Committee Notes, 1976 Adoption and 2004 Amendments; White v. Lewis, 874 F.2d	
24	599, 602-03 (9th Cir. 1989). Accordingly, the court denies petitioner's motion to strike.	
25	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion to strike (ECF No. 14) is DENIED.	
26	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of	

entry of this order within which to file his opposition to the motion to dismiss. Respondents shall have seven (7) days after the filing of the opposition within with to file their reply. The court is not inclined to grant any motions for extensions of time absent a showing of extraordinary circumstances. Dated this 11th day of January, 2012. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE