

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
4 PAUL CARLOS GARCIA,  
5 Petitioner,  
6 v.  
7 TIM VIRGA, Warden,  
8 Respondent.

No. 1:13-cv-00448-SKO HC

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S  
MOTION FOR RULING ON PETITION**

**(Doc. 29)**

9  
10 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus  
11 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, moves for a ruling on his petition.<sup>1</sup> Respondent has not filed  
12 opposition or consent.

13 A court has inherent power to control its docket and the disposition of cases with economy  
14 of time and effort for both the court and the parties. *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248,  
15 251-55 (1936); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). Because of the large  
16 volume of habeas petitions and limited Court resources, the petition in this case will be addressed  
17 in due course.

18 Accordingly, Petitioner's motion for ruling on his petition is hereby DENIED.

19  
20  
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: January 5, 2016

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

24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1), both parties consented, in writing, to the jurisdiction of a United States  
28 Magistrate Judge to conduct all further proceedings in this case, including the entry of final judgment.