

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

ROBERT A. LOPEZ,
Petitioner,

v.

G.D. LOUIS,
Respondent.

Case No. 1:12-cv-01777 AWI MJS (HC)
**ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS TO STAY
AND AMEND**
(Docs. 10, 21, 26)

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

On July 12, 2012, Petitioner filed his petition (Pet., ECF No. 1), but then on November 16, 2012, filed a motion to stay the action to allow him to exhaust state court remedies with respect to some claims in the petition. (Mot. To Stay, ECF No. 10.) On January 24, 2013, Respondent answered the petition and filed an opposition to the motion to stay. (ECF Nos. 17, 19.) On February 5, 2013, Respondent supplemented his answer and filed with the Court the California Supreme Court's decision denying Petitioner's state habeas action. (Supp., ECF No. 24.) The state court decision served to exhaust Petitioner's state court remedies.

Presently before the Court is Petitioner's motion to stay, and his motions to

1 amend the petition to either properly add exhausted claims to the petition or
2 alternatively, remove unexhausted claims from the petition. (ECF Nos. 10, 21, 26.)
3 Inasmuch as Petitioner has exhausted his state court remedies, there is no need to stay
4 the present matter. And since none of the claims in the present petition remain
5 unexhausted, and there is no need to remove unexhausted claims from the petition to
6 allow the Court to review the petition.

7 Accordingly, Petitioner's motion to stay and motions to amend are DENIED. The
8 Court shall address the merits of the petition in due course.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 30, 2013

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE