

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

\* \* \*

LANCE REBERGER,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:13-cv-00071-MMD-VPC

ORDER

This counseled petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 is before the Court on respondents' second motion for extension of time to file a reply in support of their motion to dismiss (ECF Nos. 85). The Court previously granted respondents' request for a three-week extension of time based on counsel's demanding schedule. (ECF No. 84; ECF No. 83.) Respondents' current motion seeks another three-week extension for a similar reason—demands on counsel's schedule.<sup>1</sup> (ECF 85.) Because the Court already granted an extension for a similar reason and because the Court endeavors to resolve the pending motion to dismiss by the end of March, the Court denies the requested three-week extension. However, the Court will give respondents until March 14, 2018, to file a reply in support of the motion to dismiss.

---

<sup>1</sup>In fact, the only difference between the two declarations supporting the extension motions appears to be counsel's progress in responding to a 250-page Fourth Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus due in another case on March 26, 2018. (Compare ECF No. 83, ¶ 2 with ECF No. 85, ¶ 2.)

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  
28

It is therefore ordered that respondents' second motion for extension of time (ECF No. 85) is granted in part.

DATED THIS 6<sup>th</sup> day of March 2018.



---

MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE