(HC) Light v.	Copenhaver		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6		C DICTRICT COLURT	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	JAMES LAWRENCE LIGHT, JR.,	1:12-cv-00967-DLB (HC)	
10	Petitioner,	ORDER DISREGARDING PETITIONER'S	
11	v.	MOTION TO AMEND AS MOOT IN LIGHT OF COURT'S JUNE 28, 2012, DISMISSAL OF	
12		PETITION	
13	PAUL COPENHAVER,	[Doc. 8]	
14	Respondent.		
15			
	On June 28, 2012, the undersigned dismissed the petition for writ of habeas corpus filed		
16	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, for failure to state a cognizable claim. <sup>1</sup>		
17	On July 2, 2012, Petitioner filed a motion to amend the petition for writ of habeas corpus.		
18	ECF No. 8.		
19	In his motion to amend, Petitioner repeats his challenge to Amendment 750 of the Fair		
20	Sentencing Act of 2010, which, inter alia, modified the penalties for crack cocaine offenses,		
21	reducing the disparities between penalties for crack and powder cocaine. Amendment 750,		
22	retroactively, modified the penalties for crack cocaine offenses under the United States		
23			
24	Sentencing Guidelines drug quantity table.		
25			
26			
27			
28	<sup>1</sup> On June 22, 2012, Petitioner consented to the jurisdiction of the United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1). Local Rule 305(b).		
		1	

Doc. 9

1	For the reasons explained in the Court's June 28, 2012 order dismissing the original
2	petition for writ of habeas corpus, Petitioner's motion to amend is DISREGARDED as MOOT.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: July 12, 2012 /s/ Dennis L. Beck UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	