28

1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT									
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA									
10										
11	WILLIAM ZAFRA VELASCO,) Case No. CV 15-9995-AB (SP)									
12										
13	Petitioner,) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED									
14	v. V. V. V. V. V. V. V. V. V. V									
15	JEFFREY A. BEARD, Secretary,									
16	Respondent.									
17)									
18	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition, records on									
19	file, and the May 5, 2016 Report and Recommendation of the United States									
20	Magistrate Judge. Further, the Court has engaged in a de novo review of those									
21	portions of the Report to which petitioner has objected. The Court accepts the									
22	findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge except as set forth below.									
23	With his objections to the Report and Recommendation, petitioner filed									
24	exhibits reflecting his efforts to exhaust ground one of the Petition in the state courts									
25	following his filing of the Petition in this Court. Most recently, petitioner filed a									
26	habeas petition in the California Supreme Court on April 29, 2016 in case number									
27	S234191, raising ground one. According to information available online on the									

California Courts Appellate Courts Case Information website, the California

Dockets.Justia.com

1	Supreme	Court	denied	that	habeas	petition	on	June	8,	201	16.
---	---------	-------	--------	------	--------	----------	----	------	----	-----	-----

1	Supreme Court demed that habeas petition on Julie 8, 2010.									
2	Accordingly, it appears ground one is now exhausted, making the Stay Motion									
3	now moot. If for some reason ground one is not yet exhausted, petitioner has still									
4	failed to show good cause for a stay under Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269, 125 S. Ct.									
5	1528, 161 L. Ed. 2d 440 (2005), and a stay under Kelly v. Small, 315 F.3d 1063 (9th									
6	Cir. 2003), overruled on other grounds by Robbins v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir.									
7	2007), would still be futile because ground one is plainly meritless, as set forth in the									
8	Report and Recommendation. Either way, the Stay Motion must be denied.									
9	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's Stay Motion is denied, and									
10	ground one is dismissed from the Petition with prejudice.									
11										
12	ad of									
13	DATED: August 16, 2016 HONORABLE ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.									
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE									
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
	2									