DOC. 20

2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	DIST	FRICT OF NEVADA
6		
7	JAMES R. MCDANIEL, JR.,)
8	Plaintiff,)) 3:15-cv-0
9	VS.)
10	JAMES COX et al.,) (
11	Defendants.)
12)
13	The Court dismissed the Second	Amended Complaint upon scr

McDaniel v. Cox

1

3:15-cv-00116-RCJ-WGC

ORDER

on screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, with leave to amend. When Plaintiff failed to timely amend as directed by the Court, 14 15 the Court dismissed the action without prejudice. Plaintiff later filed a Motion to Explain (ECF 16 No. 16), a Motion to Extend Time to File Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 17), a Third 17 Amended Complaint (ECF No. 18), a Motion to Add Page (ECF No. 19), a Notice of Appeal 18 (ECF No. 20), and a Motion to Respond to Appeal Documents (ECF No. 22). The Court of 19 Appeals has dismissed the appeal for failure to prosecute under Circuit Rule 42-1, and this Court 20 cannot countermand that ruling by reviving the action, even if it were inclined to reconsider. 21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 ///

1 of 2

1	CONCLUSION
2	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Extend Time to File Third Amended
3	Complaint (ECF No. 17) is DENIED, and the Motions (ECF Nos. 16, 19, 22) are DENIED as
4	moot.
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.
6	Dated this 12th day of February, 2016.
7	(anes
8	ROPERT C. JONES United States District Judge
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	