1	1		
2	2		
3	3		
4	4		
5	5		
6	6		
7	7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	RAYMOND EDWARD STEELE,		
11	11 Petitioner, No	o. 2:03-cv-0143 GEB CKD	
12	12 vs. DI	EATH PENALTY CASE	
13	WARDEN, San Quentin State Prison,		
14		RDER	
15	15 /		
16			
	16		
17		igned held a status and scheduling conference.	
17 18	17 On October 17, 2012, the unders		
	 17 On October 17, 2012, the unders 18 David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter C 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner.	
18	 17 On October 17, 2012, the unders 18 David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O 19 Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the	
18 19	 17 On October 17, 2012, the unders 18 David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O 19 Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co 20 application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) to each claim 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. Ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the n in the petition. After considering counsel's	
18 19 20	 17 On October 17, 2012, the unders 18 David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O 19 Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co 20 application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) to each claim 21 proposal, and good cause appearing, IT IS HER 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. Ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the n in the petition. After considering counsel's	
18 19 20 21	 17 On October 17, 2012, the unders 18 David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O 19 Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co 20 application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) to each claim 21 proposal, and good cause appearing, IT IS HER 22 1. By March 1, 2014, petitioner 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. Ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the n in the petition. After considering counsel's EBY ORDERED as follows: shall file a memorandum of points and authorities	
18 19 20 21 22	 On October 17, 2012, the unders David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) to each claim proposal, and good cause appearing, IT IS HER 1. By March 1, 2014, petitioner regarding the application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. Ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the n in the petition. After considering counsel's EBY ORDERED as follows: shall file a memorandum of points and authorities	
 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 On October 17, 2012, the unders David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) to each claim proposal, and good cause appearing, IT IS HER I. By March 1, 2014, petitioner regarding the application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) Petitioner's counsel are cautioned that the court 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. Ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the n in the petition. After considering counsel's EBY ORDERED as follows: shall file a memorandum of points and authorities) to each claim in the first amended petition. feels this filing date is extremely generous. Any	
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 On October 17, 2012, the unders David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) to each claim proposal, and good cause appearing, IT IS HER 1. By March 1, 2014, petitioner regarding the application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) Petitioner's counsel are cautioned that the court request for an extension of this time will be gran 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. Ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the n in the petition. After considering counsel's EBY ORDERED as follows: shall file a memorandum of points and authorities) to each claim in the first amended petition. feels this filing date is extremely generous. Any	
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 On October 17, 2012, the unders David Harshaw appeared for petitioner. Peter O Eric Christoffersen appeared for respondent. Co application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) to each claim proposal, and good cause appearing, IT IS HER 1. By March 1, 2014, petitioner regarding the application of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) Petitioner's counsel are cautioned that the court request for an extension of this time will be gran 	Giannini participated by telephone for petitioner. Ounsel proposed a schedule for briefing the n in the petition. After considering counsel's EBY ORDERED as follows: shall file a memorandum of points and authorities) to each claim in the first amended petition. feels this filing date is extremely generous. Any	

1	circumstances. Respondent shall file an opposition brief within six months after petitioner's	
2	filing. Petitioner may file a reply within three months thereafter.	
3	2. Briefing shall be limited to the application of section 2254(d) to petitioner's	
4	claims. Any motion for an evidentiary hearing and any briefing of procedural default issues will	
5	be addressed after resolution of the section 2254(d) issues.	
6	Dated: October 18, 2012	
7	Carop U. Delany	
8	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	steele 2254d brf.or	
14	steele 2234d bil.of	
15		
16 17		
17		
18		
20		
20		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
	2	

I

I