

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 GILBERT ROBLES, JR., ) 1:11-cv-00620-SKO-HC  
11 )  
12 Petitioner, ) ORDER DIRECTING PETITIONER TO  
13 v. ) SHOW CAUSE IN WRITING NO LATER  
14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ) THAN TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS AFTER  
15 Respondent. ) THE DATE OF SERVICE OF THIS ORDER  
16 ) WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE  
17 ) DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO FILE A  
18 ) COMPLETED § 2254 PETITION FORM  
19 ) AND TO FOLLOW AN ORDER OF THE  
20 ) COURT (DOCS. 1, 9)  
21 )  
22 )  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )

17 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a  
18 petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.  
19 The matter has been referred to the Magistrate Judge pursuant to  
20 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rules 302 and 303.

21 I. Background

22 Petitioner filed the petition in the United States District  
23 Court for the Northern District of California on January 5, 2011.  
24 On March 4, 2011, the court issued an order in which it noted  
25 that Petitioner, who had filed his action on a civil rights form,  
26 appeared to be challenging a conviction; however, he had failed  
27 to allege necessary information concerning exhaustion of state  
28

1 court remedies. The court concluded that it could not fairly  
2 evaluate the habeas action in its present state; it ordered the  
3 case reclassified as a habeas corpus action, and it further  
4 ordered Petitioner to file within thirty days a habeas petition  
5 to be completed on an attached 28 U.S.C. § 2254 form. The court  
6 stated that if Petitioner did not file a completed § 2254 habeas  
7 petition form within the thirty-day deadline, the case would be  
8 dismissed for failure to prosecute under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).  
9 The order was served by mail on Petitioner on March 4, 2011.  
10 (Doc. 9, 5.)

11 To date, over thirty days have passed, but Petitioner has  
12 neither filed a completed habeas petition form nor timely sought  
13 an extension of time in which to file such a petition.

14 A failure to prosecute and comply with an order of the Court  
15 may result in sanctions, including dismissal, pursuant to the  
16 inherent power of the Court or the Federal Rules of Civil  
17 Procedure. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b), 11; Local Rule 110; Chambers  
18 v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 31, 42-43 (1991).

19 II. Disposition

20 Accordingly, it is ORDERED that:

21 1. No later than twenty-one (21) days after the date of  
22 service of this order, Petitioner shall show cause why this  
23 action should not be dismissed for failure to obey the order of  
24 the United States District Court for the Northern District of  
25 California of March 4, 2011; Petitioner shall show cause in  
26 writing because the Court has determined that no hearing is  
27 necessary; and

28 ///

1           2. The failure to respond to this order will result in  
2 dismissal of the action.

3  
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 **Dated: May 3, 2011**

**/s/ Sheila K. Oberto**  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE