

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5

6 XAVIER LUMAR J'WEIAL,
7
8 Petitioner,

9 v.

10 JOE LIZARRAGA, Warden,
11
12 Respondent.

CASE NO. 1:16-cv-000044-SKO HC

ORDER ADDRESSING PETITIONER'S
REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

(Doc. 35)

13 On April 14, 2016, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss the petition in the above-entitled case.
14 Doc. 23. Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a reply (traverse) on May 9, 2016. Doc. 26.
15 Following an extension of time, Respondent replied to the traverse on June 28, 2016. Doc. 33.
16 Petitioner now moves for clarification regarding his filing an additional response. Doc. 35.

17 Neither the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts nor the
18 order setting the briefing schedule in this case (Doc. 5) authorize Petitioner to file an additional brief in
19 this case. Petitioner has already responded to the motion to dismiss by filing his reply (traverse). No
20 further briefing is authorized. The Court has taken the petition and motion to dismiss under submission
21 and will issue its determination in due course.
22

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: July 22, 2016

25 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26
27
28