

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

* * *

MATHEW LEE WILLIAMS,

v.

ISIDRO BACA, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00505-MMD-CBC

ORDER

In this habeas corpus action, Respondents filed an answer to the amended habeas petition (ECF No. 39) on October 15, 2018 (ECF No. 66). The pro se Petitioner, Mathew Lee Williams, filed a reply to the answer on December 10, 2019 (ECF No. 71). The amended petition is fully briefed, and the Court will address the merits of the Petition in due course, as its caseload allows.

On March 25, 2019, Williams filed a motion to strike (ECF No. 72), in which he appears to request that Respondents' answer be stricken because there have been multiple attorneys assigned to represent the Respondents.

Respondents did not timely file a response to Williams' motion to strike; however, on April 19, 2019, Respondents filed an opposition to the motion (ECF No. 75), along with a motion for an extension of time to file that response (ECF No. 74). In the motion for extension of time, Respondents state that they did not file a timely response to the motion to strike because of a clerical error in counsel's office. The Court finds that Respondents have shown excusable neglect, see LR 26-4, and the Court will grant their motion for extension of time and accept their opposition to the motion to strike.


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

The motion to strike is meritless and will be denied.

It is therefore ordered that Respondents' Motion for Enlargement of Time Nunc Pro Tunc (ECF No. 74) is granted. Respondents' Opposition to Motion to Strike (ECF No. 75) will be treated as timely filed.

It is further ordered that Petitioner's Motion to Strike (ECF No. 72) is denied.

DATED THIS 22nd day of April 2019.


MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE