Brennan v. Stites et al

Doc. 225

1 denied because his response to the motions for summary judgment demonstrate that he has 2 sufficient ability to litigate while at the King County Jail. (Dkt. # 224.) Defendant Hatchell also argues that Plaintiff did not point to any specific item that he is missing that prevented him from 3 4 appropriately responding to the motions for summary judgment. (*Id.*) 5 Defendant Hatchell's opposition brief was untimely. Under the Local Civil Rule 7(d)(2), 6 his brief was due on Wednesday, June 5, 2019, but he did not file it until the noting date of 7 Friday, June 7, 2019. Because Plaintiff did not have an opportunity to file a reply brief, the Court 8 DIRECTS the Clerk to RE-NOTE Plaintiff's motion for extension of time (dkt. # 220) for **June** 9 **21, 2019**. Plaintiff should file a reply brief by June 21, 2019, that addresses the issues Defendant 10 Hatchell raises and also explains to the Court how frequently he is able to access the law library 11 at the King County Jail, what legal documents he currently has access to, and what documents he 12 does not currently have access to that he believes are necessary to litigating this action. 13 The Clerk also is directed to send copies of this order to the parties and to the Honorable John C. Coughenour. 14 15 Dated this 11th day of June, 2019. 16 17 MICHELLE L. PETERSON United States Magistrate Judge 18 19 20 21 22

23