

U.S. District Court
E. D. California

(HC) Leon v. Hartley

Dockets.Justia.com

Doc. 15

Petitioner received the answer to the petition in his prior case and misunderstood it to pertain to the instant case. The traverse he filed on July 9, 2010, was in response to the answer in the prior case, but Petitioner referenced the instant case and the traverse was filed in the instant case. The Court has reviewed the various pleadings. The case numbers referenced in the answers by Respondent were correct. Petitioner's misunderstanding is unfortunate, yet it is duty incumbent on him to keep track of his cases. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion to Correct Case Number is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 6, 2010 /s/ Sandra M. Snyder UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 

U.S. District Court
E. D. California