

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JIM KATASSE,                                     )  
  ) Petitioner,                                     )  
  ) vs.    )  
WARDEN MICHAEL F.                            ) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO  
MARTEL,    ) WHY PETITION SHOULD NOT BE  
  ) CONSOLIDATED  
  ) Respondent.                                )

On November 20, 2014 petitioner Jim Katasse (“Petitioner”) purported to file a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody (“Petition”) herein, utilizing the approved Central District of California form for such petitions. ECF Docket (“Dkt.”) No. 1. Petitioner challenges his 2012 probation revocation proceedings in connection with his underlying robbery conviction sustained in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. SA063728. *Id.* Petitioner presents a single ground for relief, namely, that he was denied due process in connection with his probation revocation hearing *Id.* at 5.

While Petitioner claims not to have previously filed any habeas petitions in federal court with respect to this judgment of conviction, he, in fact, has a pending case, Katasse v. Acting Warden Neil McDowell, CV 14-06717-AB (KK). In that petition which was filed on September 30, 2014, Petitioner challenges the same

1 2012 probation revocation proceedings in connection with his underlying robbery  
2 conviction sustained in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. SA063728.  
3 In the previous petition, Petitioner presents three grounds for relief: (1) “not given  
4 discovery”; (2) “no speedy trial”; and “was never given written notice of claimed  
5 violation or disclosure of evidence against me.” Katasse v. Acting Warden Neil  
6 McDowell, CV 14-06717-AB (KK), Dkt. 3 at 5-6.

7 Because Petitioner is challenging the same probation revocation hearing, the  
8 Court finds consolidation of the actions to be appropriate. Thus, Petitioner is  
9 directed to file a response to this Order **no later than December 15, 2014**.

10 Petitioner shall state whether he consents to the consolidation of his two petitions.  
11 If Petitioner so consents, the low-number case which was filed first, Case Number  
12 CV 14-06717-AB (KK), shall be the operative case and the Court shall provide  
13 Petitioner additional time in which to file an amended petition incorporating all  
14 grounds he intends to raise.

15  
16 DATED: November 21, 2014



17  
18  
19 HON. KENLY KIYA KATO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE