

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

FRANCISCO A. LARA,

Case No. 3:17-cv-00544-MMD-WGC

Petitioner,

ORDER

v.

WARDEN BAKER, *et al.*,

Respondents.

In this habeas corpus action, brought by Nevada prisoner Francisco A. Lara, Respondents must file an answer by November 19, 2018. (*See* Order entered August 20, 2018 (ECF No. 28).)


On August 22, 2018, Respondents filed a motion for clarification (ECF No. 29), pointing out that the scheduling order in the case allows for a response to Lara's reply, and requesting clarification "whether the Court desires Respondents to respond to Lara's reply to the answer." (*See* Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 29).) Lara has responded (ECF No. 30), stating that he takes no position on Respondents' motion.

The Court will grant Respondents' motion for clarification (ECF No. 29), and will provide the following clarification. The scheduling order provides an opportunity for Respondents to respond to the reply so that they may respond to any argument in the reply that the Respondents have not previously had an opportunity to address (such as a claim of cause and prejudice relative to a procedural default, for example). It is for Respondents to determine whether a response to the reply is necessary.

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

It is therefore ordered that Respondents' Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 29) is granted, as explained above.

DATED THIS 23<sup>rd</sup> day of August 2018.



---

MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE