

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

WILLIAM RONALD CLARK,

Case No. 3:12-cv-00579-MMD-VPC

Petitioner,

ORDER

v.

RENEE BAKER, et al.,


Respondents.

In this action on a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, respondents seek clarification as to the schedule for briefing on the recently filed motion to dismiss (dkt no. 30). As required, the Court issued an order under *Klinge* v. *Eikenberry*, 849 F.2d 409 (9th Cir. 1988) and *Rand v. Rowland*, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998). That order indicated a shorter briefing schedule than that originally allowed by the Court in its initial screening order. Cf. Dkt. No. 7. The original schedule shall remain.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the motion for clarification (dkt. no. 30) is GRANTED. The schedule set out in the *Klinge* order is rescinded.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner shall have thirty (30) days to respond to the motion to dismiss, and respondents shall, thereafter, have twenty (20) days to reply.

DATED THIS 23<sup>rd</sup> day of May 2013.

  
MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE