amendments thereto, and/or any claims contained therein are not subject to dismissal as untimely. See Sossa v. Diaz, 729 F.3d 1225, 1235 (9th Cir. 2013).

It is further ordered that Respondents will file a response to the amended petition, including potentially by motion to dismiss, within sixty (60) days of service of an amended petition and that Petitioner may file a reply within thirty (30) days of service of an answer. The response and reply time to any motion filed by either party, including a motion filed in lieu of a pleading, will be governed instead by Local Rule LR 7-2(b).

It is further ordered that any procedural defenses raised by Respondents to the counseled amended petition will be raised together in a single consolidated motion to dismiss. In other words, the Court does not wish to address any procedural defenses raised herein either in *seriatum* fashion in multiple successive motions to dismiss or embedded in the answer. Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to potential waiver. Respondents will not file a response in this case that consolidates their procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If Respondents do seek dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they will do so within the single motion to dismiss not in the answer; and (b) they will specifically direct their argument to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set forth in *Cassett v. Stewart*, 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005). In short, no procedural defenses, including exhaustion, will be included with the merits in an answer. All procedural defenses, including exhaustion, instead must be raised by motion to dismiss.

It is further ordered that, in any answer filed on the merits, Respondents will specifically cite to and address the applicable state court written decision and state court record materials, if any, regarding each claim within the response as to that claim.

It is further ordered that any state court record and related exhibits filed herein by either Petitioner or Respondents will be filed with a separate index of exhibits identifying the exhibits by number. The CM/ECF attachments that are filed further will be identified by the number or numbers of the exhibits in the attachment. If the exhibits filed will span

more than one ECF Number in the record, the first document under each successive ECF Number will be either another copy of the index, a volume cover page, or some other document serving as a filler, so that each exhibit under the ECF Number thereafter will be listed under an attachment number (*i.e.*, Attachment 1, 2, etc.).

It is further ordered that the hard copy of any exhibits filed by either counsel will be delivered – for this case – to the Reno Clerk's Office.

DATED THIS 12<sup>th</sup> day of June 2018.

MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE