UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
EASTERN DISTR	RICT OF CALIFORNIA	
CHRIS LAVALE WASHINGTON,	No. 1:18-cv-00368-SKO (HC)	
Petitioner,		
V.	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISMISSAL OF PETITIONER FOR	
C. PFEIFFER, Warden,	FAILURE TO OBEY A COURT ORDER	
Respondent.	COURT CLERK TO ASSIGN DISTRICT JUDGE	
	(Doc. 1)	
Petitioner, Chris Lavale Washington, is a state prisoner proceeding with a petition for writ		
of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 19, 2018, Petitioner filed his petition		
for writ of habeas corpus and a motion to stay proceedings so that he may exhaust his state court		
remedies. (Docs. 1, 2.) On March 29, 2018, United States Magistrate Judge Stanley A. Boone		
ordered Petitioner to file supplemental briefing regarding the stay. (Doc. 5.) After being granted		
multiple extensions of time, Petitioner filed the supplemental briefing and the undersigned granted		
On October 2, 2018, the undersigned ordered Petitioner to show cause why the case should		
not be distillissed for familie to obey a couff of de	1	
	EASTERN DISTR CHRIS LAVALE WASHINGTON, Petitioner, v. C. PFEIFFER, Warden, Respondent. Petitioner, Chris Lavale Washington, i of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 225 for writ of habeas corpus and a motion to stay remedies. (Docs. 1, 2.) On March 29, 2018 ordered Petitioner to file supplemental briefin multiple extensions of time, Petitioner filed the a stay of proceedings on June 5, 2018. (Doc.	

1	(Doc. 17.) Petitioner responded to the order to show cause on October 22, 2018, advising the Court
2	that the California Supreme Court had made a final determination in his case, and requested that
3	the Court lift the stay. (Doc. 18.)
4 ~	On October 23, 2018, the undersigned lifted the stay and directed Petitioner to file an
5	amended petition within 30 days. Although more than 30 days have passed, Petitioner has failed
6 7	to file an amended petition or respond to the undersigned's order in any way.
8	The Court has the discretion to impose any and all sanctions authorized by statute or rule or
9	within the inherent power of the Court, including dismissal of an action based on Petitioner's failure
10	to comply with a court order. Fed .R. Civ. P. 11; Local R. 110. Because Petitioner has failed to
11	respond to the undersigned's order to file an amended complaint, the undersigned recommends
12	dismissing the action.
13	Contificate of Appealshility
14	Certificate of Appealability
15	A petitioner seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district
16	court's denial of his petition, but may only appeal in certain circumstances. Miller-El v. Cockrell,
17	537 U.S. 322, 335-36 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate
18	of appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides:
19	(a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before
20	a district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is held.
21	court of appears for the circuit in which the proceeding is held.
22	(b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the validity of a warrant to remove to another district or place for
23	commitment or trial a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of such person's detention pending
24	removal proceedings.
25	(c) (1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of
26	appealability, an appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from—
27	(Λ) the final order in a holeses corrug proceeding in which the
28	(A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State 2

1	court; or
2	(B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.
3	(2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1)
4	only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.
5	(3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall
6	indicate which specific issues or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).
7	
8	If a court denies a habeas petition, the court may only issue a certificate of appealability "if
9	jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or
10	that jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed
11	further." Miller-El, 537 U.S. at 327; Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Although the
12 13	petitioner is not required to prove the merits of his case, he must demonstrate "something more than
13 14	the absence of frivolity or the existence of mere good faith on his part." Miller-El, 537 U.S.
15	at 338.
16	In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find the Court's
17	determination that Petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or
18	deserving of encouragement to proceed further. Accordingly, the Court recommends declining to
19	issue a certificate of appealability.
20	Recommendation
21	
22	Based on the foregoing, the undersigned hereby recommends that the Court dismiss the
23	petition in this action without prejudice for failure to obey a court order and decline to issue a
24	certificate of appealability.
25	These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge
26	assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C § 636(b)(1). Within thirty (30) days
27	after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, either party may file written
28	3

1	objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's
2	Findings and Recommendations." Replies to the objections, if any, shall be served and filed within
3	fourteen (14) days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file
4	objections within the specified time may constitute waiver of the right to appeal the District Court's
5	order. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 ((9th Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923)
6	F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).
7	
8	The Court Clerk is hereby directed to assign a district judge to this action.
9	
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	Dated: December 11, 2018 [s] Sheila K. Oberto
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	4
	4