

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

* * *

JEREMY TURNER,

Petitioner,

v.

RENEE BAKER, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00139-MMD-WGC

ORDER

On March 21, 2019, Respondents filed an answer to the amended habeas petition (ECF No. 53). The *pro se* Petitioner, Jeremy Turner, is due to file his reply (traverse) by May 20, 2019. (See ECF No. 28 (Order entered December 21, 2017, providing 60 days for reply).)

On April 19, 2019, Turner filed a motion for extension of time (ECF No. 54), requesting a 60-day extension of time, to July 19, 2019, for his reply. The Court finds that Turner's motion for extension of time is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that there is good cause for the extension of time. The Court will grant the extension of time as requested. However, the Court will not look favorably upon any motion to further extend this deadline.

On February 13, 2019, Respondents filed a Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 47), and on February 27, 2019, Respondents filed a Supplement to Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 49) ("Motions"). In both, Respondents question whether Turner signed his original and amended habeas petitions and ask the Court to require Turner to file a statement confirming that he did so. In his response, Turner states, under penalty of perjury, that he did sign his original and amended petitions. (See ECF No. 50 at 3–4.) The

///

1 Court accepts Turner's statement. This renders moot the Respondents' Motions, and they
2 will be denied on that ground.

3 On February 19, 2019, Turner filed a motion for reconsideration of the denial of his
4 latest—his fourth—motion for appointment of counsel (ECF No. 48). The Court
5 determines that Turner shows no ground for reconsideration of that order. See Fed. R.
6 Civ. P. 60.

7 It is therefore ordered that Petitioner's Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No.
8 54) is granted. Petitioner will have until and including July 19, 2019, to file his reply to
9 Respondents' answer.

10 It is further ordered that Respondents' Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 47) and
11 Supplement to Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 49) are denied, as moot.

12 It is further ordered that Petitioner's Request for Reconsideration regarding his
13 Fourth Motion to Appoint Counsel (ECF No. 48) is denied.

14 DATED THIS 22nd day of April 2019.



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE