

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 15-cv-02705-GPG

STANLEY FOOTE,

Applicant,

v.

T.K. RHODES-COZZA, USP Florence,

Respondent.

ORDER TO FILE PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Applicant is in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and currently is incarcerated at the ADX in Florence, Colorado. Applicant initiated this action by filing *pro se* an Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 that challenges violation of his due process rights in a disciplinary proceeding. Applicant paid the \$5 filing fee.

As part of the preliminary consideration of the Application in this case and pursuant to *Keck v. Hartley*, 550 F. Supp. 2d 1272 (D. Colo. 2008), the Court has determined that a limited Preliminary Response is appropriate. Respondent is directed pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts to file a Preliminary Response limited to addressing the affirmative defense of exhaustion of administrative remedies with respect to his denial of due process in his disciplinary action based on the lack of evidence and failure of prison staff to follow directions of the regional director. If Respondent does not intend to raise this affirmative defense, Respondent

must notify the Court of that decision in the Preliminary Response. Respondent may not file a dispositive motion as a Preliminary Response, or an Answer, or otherwise address the merits of the claims in response to this Order.

In support of the Preliminary Response, Respondent should attach as exhibits all relevant portions of the administrative record, including but not limited to copies of all documents demonstrating whether Applicant has exhausted administrative remedies.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that **within twenty-one days from the date of this Order** Respondent shall file a Preliminary Response that complies with this Order. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that **within twenty-one days of the filing of the Preliminary Response** Applicant may file a Reply, if he desires. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that if Respondent does not intend to raise the affirmative defense of exhaustion of administrative remedies, Respondent must notify the Court of that decision in the Preliminary Response.

Dated: December 16, 2015

BY THE COURT:

s/Gordon P. Gallagher
United States Magistrate Judge