

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

INGINIO HERNANDEZ,)	3:13-cv-00083-MMD-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	January 5, 2016
)	
RENEE BAKER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	
)	

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

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court are two motions filed by Plaintiff: ECF No. 166, filed on December 30, 2015, and ECF No. 167, filed on January 4, 2016. For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff's motions are **granted in part** and **denied in part**.

ECF No. 166

As best as the court can discern, ECF No. 166 seeks a fourth extension of time to file Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation. Hidden within the motion is a request for an extension of Plaintiff's copy work limit in the amount of Ten Dollar (\$10.00). Plaintiff states he needs the copy work extension so that he can "be able to maken the copy to [serve]" a copy of his objections on the Defendants. (*Id.* at 3.)

The record reflects that on December 29, 2015, District Judge Du granted Plaintiff's motions for extension of time (ECF Nos. 159 and 163) nunc pro tunc (ECF No. 165) and that on January 4, 2016, Plaintiff filed his objections (ECF No. 168).

Therefore, the component of Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 166) which seeks fourth extension of time to file his objections is **denied as moot**; however, Plaintiff's request for a copy work extension in the amount of \$10.00 is **granted**.

