

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

DAE HENDERSON, JR.,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
HUNTER ANGLEA, Warden,  
Respondent.

No. 1:18-cv-00143-AWI-SKO HC  
**ORDER DENYING AS MOOT MOTION  
TO POST SECURITY FOR FEES AND  
COSTS**  
**ORDER DENYING AS MOOT MOTION  
TO TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE**  
**(Docs. 2, 13)**

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On January 26, 2018, Petitioner filed a motion entitled “Notice of motion to post security fees and costs; affidavit in support thereof; complaint; documentation in support thereof [FRCP 9(h); supplemental admiralty and maritime claims Rule(s) C(1)(a); C(2)(a)-(c); C(3)(a)(i); C(3)(b)(ii); E(2)(a)(b) 28 U.S.C.A.]” In the motion, Petitioner requests “an order permitting that all fees and costs . . . with the filing . . . be charged to the order of the Defendant.” The Court granted Petitioner *in forma pauperis* status on February 5, 2018; therefore Petitioner’s motion is moot.

//

1           On February 28, 2018, Petitioner filed a motion entitled “Motion that Court take judicial  
2 notice; and request for opportunity to be heard [Fed. Rules of Evid. 201].” This motion to take  
3 judicial notice was filed in conjunction with Petitioner’s first amended complaint. The Court  
4 dismissed the first amended complaint with leave to amend on February 28, 2018. Subsequently,  
5 on March 12, 2018, Petitioner filed his second amended complaint. Because the motion to take  
6 judicial notice relates to the first amended complaint, which was dismissed, the Court will deny  
7 this motion as moot.  
8

9           To the extent Petitioner is requesting an evidentiary hearing; a court has inherent power to  
10 control its docket and the disposition of cases with economy of time and effort for both the court  
11 and the parties. *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 251-55 (1936); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*,  
12 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). Petitioner’s motion is most efficiently considered when the  
13 Court begins its review of the record and consideration of the petition. Because of the large  
14 volume of habeas petitions and limited Court resources, the petition in this case will be addressed  
15 in due course.  
16

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19  
20 Dated: March 27, 2018

/s/ Sheila K. Olerto  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE