

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HONOFRE JAMES O CHARGUALAF,

Petitioner,

v.

RAFAEL ZUNIGA,

Respondent.

1:15-cv-00462-LJO-SAB-HC

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S
MOTION TO EXPEDITE RULING
(ECF No. 9)

Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se in a habeas corpus action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

On June 9, 2015, Petitioner filed a motion to compel Respondent to provide a response to the petition. (ECF No. 9). Upon review of the motion, the Court will construe this motion as a motion to expedite proceedings in the pending petition for writ of habeas corpus.

The Court notes that it does not have an expedited calendar. Petitioner is advised that the Court acts to resolve all pending cases in the most efficient manner possible. The Court is aware of Petitioner's pending petition. On June 9, 2015, prior to Petitioner's motion to compel being docketed, the undersigned issued an order to show cause in this matter. (ECF No. 8). The order to show cause contained notice that Petitioner shall show cause why the petition should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 within thirty days of the date of service of that order. (ECF No. 8). Respondent shall then file a reply to Petitioner's response to the

1 order to show cause within thirty days of the date Petitioner's brief is filed with the Court. (ECF
2 No. 8). The Court will then review the briefs submitted by the parties. The Court notes that the
3 Court's docket of pending cases is substantial, and the Court must act first on those matters that
4 have been pending the longest. Therefore, Petitioner's motion to expedite must be denied.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's motion to expedite the
6 pending petition for writ of habeas corpus is DENIED.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: June 23, 2015


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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