

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11
12 **JEROME LEE CROSS,**

13 Petitioner,

14 **v.**

15
16 **KINGS COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT,**

17 Respondent.
18

Case No. 1:14-cv-00863 MJS (HC)

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION
TO AMEND PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS**

(Docs. 22, 24)

19 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas
20 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The parties have consented to Magistrate Judge
21 jurisdiction. (ECF Nos. 6-7.)

22 On June 6, 2014, Petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus. (Pet., ECF
23 No. 1.) On September 2, 2014, the Court dismissed the petition as untimely. (ECF No.
24 12.) Petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration of the judgment on September 12, 2014.
25 (ECF No. 14.) On December 12, 2014, the Court granted the motion for reconsideration
26 in part. (ECF No. 21.) The Court granted the motion with regard to claim one, but found
27 nevertheless it had been properly dismissed for failure to exhaust (rather than for being
28

1 untimely as found earlier). However, the Court denied the motion for reconsideration as
2 to the second through fourth claims as they remained untimely.

3 On September 18, 2015, the Court received a motion to amend the petition for
4 writ of habeas corpus. (ECF No. 22.) Respondent filed a response to the motion on
5 October 7, 2015, and Petitioner filed a reply on November 6, 2015. (ECF No. 23-24.)

6 The motion to amend only addresses substantive issues presented in the claims,
7 and does not address the issues of exhaustion and untimeliness that formed the basis of
8 the dismissal of the petition.

9 Based on the Court's review of the motion to amend, the Court's dismissal of the
10 petition would remain unchanged despite Petitioner's attempt to rephrase the arguments
11 in his petition.

12 The Court finds that amendment would be futile such that justice does not require
13 amendment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to
14 Amend be DENIED.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: March 23, 2016

18 /s/ Michael J. Seng
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28