

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

JAMES GEORGE STAMOS, JR.,
Petitioner,

v.

RANDY GROUNDS,
Respondent.

1:15-cv-01838 DAD MJS HC
**ORDER RESPONDING TO PETITIONER'S
NOTICE TO THE COURT THAT HE HAS
YET TO RECEIVE A RESPONSIVE
PLEADING FROM RESPONDENT**

(Doc. 32.)

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Petitioner filed the present petition on October 13, 2015. (ECF No. 1.) On January 13, 2016, the Court ordered Respondent to file a response to the petition. (ECF No. 19.) On March 14, 2016, the Court granted Respondent's request for an extension of time to file a response. On April 15, 2016, Petitioner filed a notice with the Court that he had not received a responsive pleading from Respondent. (ECF No. 32.) Petitioner appears to have dated and mailed the notice on April 12, 2016. (Id.)

According to the Court's docket, Respondent filed an answer to the petition on April 13, 2016. (Answer, ECF No. 31.) Attached to the answer is a proof of service stating that a copy of the answer was mailed to Petitioner on the same date. (Id.) It

1 therefore appears that Petitioner's notice and Respondent's answer "crossed paths" in
2 the mail, and it is likely that Petitioner should receive a copy of the answer in due course
3 if it has not already been received.

4 Should, for some reason, Petitioner not receive a copy of the answer, he should
5 contact Respondent and request an additional copy be sent. Further, if Petitioner is not
6 in receipt of the answer, and requires additional time to file a traverse, he may request
7 an extension of time to file a traverse from the Court.

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: April 19, 2016

/s/ Michael J. Seng
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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