

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

DAVID W. WATTS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAN WESTFIELD and RICK RAEMISCH,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

10-cv-550-slc

On March 9, 2011, I ordered defendants to respond to plaintiff's motions for preliminary injunctions at the same time that they filed their answer. I also ordered plaintiff to file his reply within fourteen days of defendants' response. Defendants filed their response on April 19, 2011, which meant that plaintiff's reply was due on May 3, 2011. Instead of a filing reply, plaintiff has moved to extend his reply deadline on his injunction motions. Plaintiff also asks for more time to respond to defendants' answer.

I will give plaintiff more time for his reply on the injunction, but he doesn't need to respond to the answer. In fact, Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a) *forbids* a plaintiff from submitting a reply to an answer unless the court directs him to, and I haven't done that here. That's because the court automatically assumes that a plaintiff is denying all of the defendants' averments in their answer and affirmative defenses. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b)(6).

Plaintiff may have a short extension of time to file his reply in support of his motions for preliminary injunctions. In his April 28, 2011 letter, plaintiff states that he was recently moved to another prison and asks for a 30-day extension of time. Plaintiff may have until Friday, May 27, 2011 to file his reply. Plaintiff will not get another extension of this deadline.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff David Watt's motion for extension of time, dkt. 41, is GRANTED in part. Plaintiff may have until May 27, 2011 to file his reply in support of his motions for preliminary injunctions.

Entered this 6<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER  
Magistrate Judge