(HC) Lewis v	v. Woodford	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	MILTON OTIS LEWIS,	
11	Petitioner,	No. CIV S-02-0013 FCD GGH DP
12	VS.	DEATH PENALTY CASE
13	ROBERT AYERS, Warden	
14	Respondent.	<u>ORDER</u>
15		
16	Within 14 days of the filed date of this order, the parties shall file concurrent	
17	briefs informing the court of their position with respect to:	
18	(a) the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal to review a denial of a motion to stay	
19	proceedings;	
20	(b) if an interlocutory appeal is appropriate, to what extent the district court is	
	(b) If all interioct	nory appear is appropriate, to what extent the district court is
21	. ,	nue on with the merits of the action preceding trial (evidentiary
21 22	deprived of jurisdiction to contin	
	deprived of jurisdiction to continue hearing) and the evidentiary hear	nue on with the merits of the action preceding trial (evidentiary
22	deprived of jurisdiction to continue hearing) and the evidentiary hear	nue on with the merits of the action preceding trial (evidentiary ring itself, considering that the issue on appeal (present ated to the merits of the habeas petition itself.
22 23	deprived of jurisdiction to continue hearing) and the evidentiary hear competency to proceed) is unrel	nue on with the merits of the action preceding trial (evidentiary ring itself, considering that the issue on appeal (present ated to the merits of the habeas petition itself. /s/ Gregory G. Hollows
22 23 24	deprived of jurisdiction to continue hearing) and the evidentiary hear competency to proceed) is unrel	nue on with the merits of the action preceding trial (evidentiary ring itself, considering that the issue on appeal (present ated to the merits of the habeas petition itself.

Doc. 155