

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

ADRIAN LEWIS CHATEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

RON VAN BOENING, DANIEL
FITZPATRICK, MIKE HINES, MICHAESL
A. FLEMMING, RYAN T. DENZER, and
GEORGE GILBERT,

Defendants.


No. C09-5615 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS'
ANSWER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to respond to Defendants' Answer to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. ECF No. 47. Defendants' Answer contains no counterclaim and the court has not ordered a response to the Answer. Under these circumstances, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not allow or require the filing of a response to the Defendants' Answer to the Amended Complaint in this case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 7. Accordingly, there is no need for the extension of time sought by Plaintiff and therefore, his motion (ECF No. 47) shall be **DENIED**.

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel for Defendants.

DATED this 6th day of December, 2010.


Karen L. Strombom
United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER- 1