UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANTHONY BURRIOLA,

Petitioner,

vs.

ISIDRO BACA, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:13-cv-00574-RCJ-VPC

ORDER

Petitioner has filed a motion for clarification (ECF No. 35). He purports to be confused by the court's granting respondents additional time to file an answer, because the order (ECF No. 32) stated nothing about the time to file a reply to the answer. When, as here, the court states nothing about an already existing deadline, then the order has no effect on that deadline. Petitioner had forty-five (45) days from the date of service of the answer (ECF No. 33) to file a reply. The court will give petitioner some additional time to file his reply.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion for clarification (ECF No. 35) is **GRANTED**. Petitioner will have fourteen (14) days from the date of entry of this order to file and serve a reply to respondents' answer (ECF No. 33).

Dated: August 23, 2016

ROBERT C. JONES
United States District Judge