

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT TACOMA

9 DARYL ROGERS,

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

12 RONALD HAYNES,

13 Respondent.

Case No. C22-05367-LK-SKV

ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER'S  
REQUEST TO FILE AMENDED  
RESPONSE TO ANSWER

14 This is a federal habeas action proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Respondent has filed  
15 an answer to the federal habeas petition. Dkt. 7. On August 18, 2022, Petitioner filed a response  
16 to the answer. Dkt. 11. On August 29, 2022, Petitioner filed a document entitled "request to file  
17 supplemental response motion to respondent[']s answer" along with a 165 page attachment  
18 which appears to be a new or amended response to Respondent's answer. Dkt. 12. Petitioner  
19 requests that this filing be considered "in place of" his previously filed August 18, 2022,  
20 response to the answer. *Id.* Petitioner's request was not docketed as a motion and Respondent  
21 has not responded to the request. Respondent has also not filed a reply to either Petitioner's  
22  
23

ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER'S REQUEST  
TO FILE AMENDED RESPONSE TO ANSWER - 1

original response to the answer, Dkt. 11, or to the document Petitioner filed as a replacement for, or amendment to, the original response to the answer, Dkt. 12.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, for the sake of clarity, the Court hereby orders:

(1) Petitioner's "request to file supplemental response motion to respondent['']s answer" is

GRANTED and the Court will consider Petitioner's filing, Dkt. 12, as an amended response to the answer and to constitute a complete replacement for Petitioner's original response to Respondent's answer, Dkt. 11.

(2) Respondent may file a reply to Petitioner's amended response to the answer, Dkt. 12, by **September 23, 2022**.

(3) The Clerk is directed to re-note the Respondent's answer, Dkt. 7, to **September 23, 2022**.

(4) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this order to the parties and to the Honorable Lauren King.

Dated this 16<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022.

  
S. KATE VAUGHAN  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes it is unclear whether Respondent was waiting for the Court to rule on Petitioner's request prior to filing a reply.