| 1 | | |
|--|---|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| б | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | EDDYS LINAREZ NAJERA, |) CASE NO. CV 13-3761 PSG (RZ) |
| 12 | Petitioner, |)) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE |
| 13 | VS. |) RE TIMELINESS |
| 14 | WARDEN, | |
| 15 | Despendent | |
| 10 | Respondent. |) |
| 16 | Kespondent. |) |
| | |)) Show Cause directed to Petitioner because the |
| 16 | |) Show Cause directed to Petitioner because the |
| 16 17 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. |) Show Cause directed to Petitioner because the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act |
| 16 17 18 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the | |
| 16 17 18 19 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the ("AEDPA"), a portion of which established | Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the ("AEDPA"), a portion of which established a habeas corpus petition in federal court | Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act d a one-year statute of limitations for bringing |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the ("AEDPA"), a portion of which established a habeas corpus petition in federal court limitations period commences on the date a | Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act d a one-year statute of limitations for bringing . 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). In most cases, the |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the ("AEDPA"), a portion of which established a habeas corpus petition in federal court limitations period commences on the date a U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). The limitations period | Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act d a one-year statute of limitations for bringing . 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). In most cases, the a petitioner's conviction became final. <i>See</i> 28 |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the ("AEDPA"), a portion of which established a habeas corpus petition in federal court limitations period commences on the date a U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). The limitations period whichever is latest, if any of them falls after | Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act d a one-year statute of limitations for bringing . 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). In most cases, the a petitioner's conviction became final. <i>See</i> 28 will start instead on one of the following dates, |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the ("AEDPA"), a portion of which established a habeas corpus petition in federal court limitations period commences on the date a U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). The limitations period whichever is latest, if any of them falls after date on which a State-created impediment - | Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act d a one-year statute of limitations for bringing . 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). In most cases, the a petitioner's conviction became final. <i>See</i> 28 will start instead on one of the following dates, the petitioner's conviction becomes final: the |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | The Court issues this Order To action may be time-barred. In 1996, Congress enacted the ("AEDPA"), a portion of which established a habeas corpus petition in federal court limitations period commences on the date a U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). The limitations period whichever is latest, if any of them falls after date on which a State-created impediment removed; the date on which a newly-recog | Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act d a one-year statute of limitations for bringing . 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). In most cases, the a petitioner's conviction became final. <i>See</i> 28 will start instead on one of the following dates, the petitioner's conviction becomes final: the - itself a violation of Constitutional law – was |

The time spent in state court pursuing collateral relief in a timely manner is
 excluded, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(2), and the statute also is subject to equitable tolling.
 Holland v. Florida, U.S. __, 130 S. Ct. 2549, 2562, 177 L. Ed. 2d 130 (2010).

- The current petition was filed on May 28, 2013. From the face of the petition
 and from judicially-noticeable materials, the Court discerns as follows:
- 6 (a) On August 22, 2011, in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Petitioner pleaded no
 7 contest to several charges, including robbery. *See* Pet. ¶¶ 2 (convictions), 5 (no
 8 contest plea). He was sentenced to 29 years in prison. Pet. ¶ 2(f).
- 9 (b) Petitioner did not appeal. Pet. ¶ 3. His conviction became final after Friday,
 10 October 21, 2011, after his 60-day deadline for seeking a certificate of probable
 11 cause, and noticing an appeal, expired. *See* CAL. R. CT., Rules 8.304(b) (need for
 12 certificate) & 8.308 (60 day deadline). Petitioner's one-year AEDPA limitations
 13 period began to run at that time.
- (c) Over nine months passed. On July 26, 2012, Petitioner tolled the AEDPA limitations period by beginning a series of unsuccessful state habeas petitions in the trial court, California Court of Appeal and California Supreme Court. The latter court denied his final state petition on November 14, 2012. *See* docket in *In re Najera*, Cal. Supreme Ct. case no. S205006. Petitioner's AEDPA limitations period again began to run after that date, with just under three months remaining.
- 20 (d) Over six months later, Petitioner commenced this action.
- 21

* * * * *

Unless this Court has miscalculated the limitations period, or some form of
 additional tolling applies in sufficient measure, this action is time-barred. It became stale
 in February of 2013, three months after the California Supreme Court denied his final state
 habeas challenge.

No basis appears in the petition for a later AEDPA-limitations-period starting
 date. Nor does the face of the petition disclose any basis for equitable tolling.

28

-2-

| 1 | This Court may raise <i>sua sponte</i> the question of the statute of limitations bar, | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | so long as it gives Petitioner an opportunity to be heard on the matter. Herbst v. Cook, 260 | |
| 3 | F.3d 1039 (9th Cir. 2001). Accordingly, Petitioner shall show cause in writing why this | |
| 4 | action should not be dismissed as being barred by the one-year statute of limitations. | |
| 5 | Petitioner shall file his response to the Court's Order to Show Cause not later than 21 days | |
| б | from the filing date of this Order. | |
| 7 | If Petitioner does not file a response within the time allowed, the action may | |
| 8 | be dismissed for failure to timely file, and for failure to prosecute. | |
| 9 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | DATED: June 3, 2013 | |
| 12 | ρ , γ | |
| 13 | PAULA ANGLE | |
| 14 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |