Hernandez v. Baker et al Doc. 173

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

INGINIO HERNANDEZ,	) 3:13-cv-00083-MMD-WGC	
Plaintiff,	) MINUTES OF THE COURT	
VS.	) ) January 29, 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 is Plaintiff's motion seeking a fourth extension of time. (ECF No. 172.) Plaintiff seeks an extension "of a statutory period of limiting to due process, when NDOC deny, or delay, a Plaintiff intentionally by interfere with his process." Plaintiff's motion also has attached to it two exhibits: an Emergency Grievance Form and an Inmate Request Form, both of which pertain to his efforts to obtain his legal supplies. (ECF No. 172 at 4-5.) Although Plaintiff's motion is difficult to decipher, it appears he is seeking to replenish his legal supplies so that he can (1) "be able to submitted on response as a few motions to the court and to the attorneys by Defendants"; and (2) for any motion if be coming in my way...to response the Defendants or ... be they opposition to Plaintiff's motion to response."

It also appears that Plaintiff is seeking the Defendants to send him a copy of the "motion" he sent to counsel for Defendants on January 18, 2016, which he states is "another fourth refus[al] [by N]DOC of the court order for extension of a Plaintiff copy work." (*Id.* at 2.) A review of the record reflects that what Plaintiff is seeking is a copy of ECF No. 171, entitled "Exhibit L," filed on January 19, 2016. It appears Plaintiff used a page out of ECF No. 132 (132-14) to write his certificate of service of the attachments which are marked Exhibit A-1 of 2 and A-2 of 2, an Emergency Grievance Form concerning the \$10.00 copywork extension which Plaintiff complains the law library supervisor is refusing to honor, and a Legal Copy Work Request which was denied. It appears the document Plaintiff was seeking to have copied is some 89 pages in length.

## MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:13-cv-00083-MMD-WGC

Date: January 29, 2016 Page 2

To the extent Plaintiff may be having difficulty obtaining copies via the copywork extension this court granted on January 4, 2016 (ECF No. 169), counsel for Defendants shall insure that the order extending copywork has been provided the appropriate personnel at Northern Nevada Correctional Center. Counsel shall also send a copy of ECF No. 171 to Plaintiff.

With regard to Plaintiff's request for an extension of time, and to set Plaintiff's mind at ease, the court has reviewed the docket in his case. There are no outstanding motions or responses to which a response or reply is due. Defendants have responded (ECF No. 170) to Plaintiff's objections (ECF No. 168) to this court's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 158). Local Rule IB 3-1(a) does not contemplate or allow the filing of a reply to a response to an objection.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, there is no need for an extension of time and Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 172) is **DENIED AS MOOT.** 

IT IS SO ORDERED.

	E S. WIESOI	i, czziar	
By:	/s/		
<i>-</i>			
	Deputy Clerk		

LANCES WILSON CLERK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Inasmuch as there is no reply due, the court assumes Plaintiff will not waste \$8.90 of his \$10.00 copy work extension to file a document that is unnecessary.