

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

CARL HENRY OLSEN, III,

Petitioner,

v.

RENE BAKER, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:15-cv-00367-MMD-WGC

ORDER

This habeas matter is before the Court on Respondents' fourth Unopposed Motion to Extend Time (ECF No. 58).<sup>1</sup>

Respondents seek a one-week extension of time to file the exhibits to their Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 56) Petitioner Carl Henry Olsen, III's Second Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 45). The motion states that extensive redaction is required because Petitioner's criminal case involved a minor victim and witness. Respondents' counsel asserts that the redaction process has taken longer than expected, despite best efforts, because the records were obtained from microfiche and are not of sufficient quality to allow for automated redaction.

The motion falls short of providing compelling circumstances or a strong showing of good cause given that this action was reopened in July 2017 and the second amended petition was filed over eight months ago in May 2019. Nevertheless, the Court will

///

<sup>1</sup>In the order granting Respondents' third request for an extension of time, counsel was advised:

Given the Court's case management responsibilities under the CJRA, moving forward counsel will be required to prioritize the briefing in this case over later-filed matters. . . . **Further extensions of time are not likely to be granted absent compelling circumstances and a strong showing of good cause why the briefing could not be completed within the extended time allowed despite the exercise of due diligence.**

(ECF No. 55.)

1 reluctantly allow an additional three days. The parties are advised that the Court's warning  
2 regarding further extensions remains in effect. (ECF No. 55.)

3 It is therefore ordered that Respondents' motion is granted in part and denied in  
4 part. Respondents have until February 3, 2020, to file the exhibits.

5 It is further ordered that Petitioner will have 14 days after service of the exhibits to  
6 file and serve any response to the motion to dismiss.

7 All other instructions stated in the scheduling order (ECF No. 33) and the warning  
8 regarding further extensions (ECF No. 55) remain in effect.

9 DATED THIS 29<sup>th</sup> day of January 2020.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



---

MIRANDA M. DU  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE