

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

RICHARD ANTHONY PETERSON,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
JOE LIZARRAGA, Warden of MCSP,  
Defendant.

No. 1:17cv-01537-LJO-SKO HC  
**ORDER DISCHARGING  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE  
ORDER GRANTING 30 DAY  
EXTENSION OF TIME  
(Doc. 25)**

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On January 4, 2018, this Court ordered Respondent to show cause within fifteen days why he should not be sanctioned for failure to file an answer to the petition. The order provided that the Court would consider Respondent’s filing of the answer to be an appropriate response.

On January 5, 2018, Respondent advised the Court that on December 29, 2017, he filed a motion for a 30-day extension of time; however, Respondent filed the motion using the case’s

1 original case number, 2:17-cv-01693.<sup>1</sup> This case was transferred from the Sacramento Division  
2 of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California to this Court on  
3 November 17, 2017. All further submissions should be filed under case number 1:17-cv-01537.

4 Respondent declares in his motion for 30-day extension of time that due to the press of  
5 business he requires additional time to prepare a response. Respondent has shown good cause for  
6 an extension of time.  
7

8 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS as follows:

- 9 1. The order to show cause issued January 4, 2018, (Doc. 25), be discharged.
- 10 2. Respondent is DIRECTED to file his response by January 29, 2018.

11  
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: January 8, 2018

14 */s/ Sheila K. Oberto*  
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Respondent contends that the Court concluded “reasonably, but mistakenly, that Respondent had failed to respond  
28 to the petition or seek an application for an extension of time within the allotted time.” (Doc. 26 at 3.) Respondent is responsible for the management of his own case, including ensuring that documents are filed with the appropriate court, following the transfer of the case from the Sacramento division to the Fresno division of this district .