

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

<p>RICHARD J. VIEIRA,</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">vs.</p> <p>Michael Martel, as Acting Warden of San Quentin State Prison,</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">Respondent.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>Case No. 1:05-cv-1492-OWW</p> <p><u>DEATH PENALTY CASE</u></p> <p>ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT’S THIRD REQUEST TO MODIFY BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR PHASE III OF THE LITIGATION</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Respondent Michael Martel, as Acting Warden of San Quentin State Prison (the ‘‘Warden’’) has submitted a request to modify the briefing schedule set July 22, 2010 and last modified May 10, 2011 (doc. 90). The proposed new schedule extends briefing due dates by one month. The Warden’s counsel reports that Petitioner Richard J. Vieira (‘‘Vieira’’) has no objection to the requested modification.

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING,

- 1. The Warden’s memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to the petition shall be filed on or before July 5, 2011. The Warden shall defer his discussion of the application of *Cullen v. Pinholster*, 131 S. Ct. 1388 (2011), until briefing on Vieira’s anticipated motion for an evidentiary hearing.
- 2. Vieira shall file a reply brief on or before October 3, 2011.
- 3. The parties are encouraged to meet and confer about the need to conduct discovery. It is anticipated that motions for formal discovery pursuant to Rule 6 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases or record expansion pursuant to Rule 7 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases will be presented and resolved without altering the schedule for briefing the petition.

1 4. Vieira shall file his motion for an evidentiary hearing pursuant to Rule 8 of the Rules Governing
2 § 2254 Cases on or before November 7, 2011. The evidentiary motion shall be limited to
3 identification of: (a) the claims for which a hearing is sought; (b) an offer of proof as to the
4 evidence sought to be presented; (c) a brief statement of the legal grounds for the evidentiary
5 hearing; and (d) an explanation of diligence exercised in state court to develop the claims before
6 the California Supreme Court (*see* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(2)). In light of the briefing of the
7 petition, legal analysis and citation of authorities in support of claims for which a hearing is
8 sought will not be necessary. The exception to presentation of legal analysis and citation to
9 authority involves briefing the application of *Pinholster* to Vieira's entitlement to further
10 evidentiary development.

11 5. The Warden shall file his opposition to the evidentiary hearing motion on or before December
12 5, 2011.

13 6. Vieira shall file his reply to the opposition on or before January 11, 2012.

14 SO ORDERED.

15 Date: June 1, 2011

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger
Oliver W. Wanger
United States District Judge

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28