1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RICHARD ALEX WILLIAMS,	No. 2:03-cv-0721-KJM-AC
12	Petitioner,	
13	v.	ORDER
14	CHERYL PLILER, Warden,	
15	Respondent.	
16		
17		
18	This matter is before the court on petitioner Richard Alex Williams's request for	
19	enforcement of this court's previous order. For the following reasons, the court DENIES the	
20	request.	
21	On June 26, 2014, the court issued an order granting Williams's petition for writ of	
22	habeas corpus. ECF No. 114. On July 21, 20	014, the respondent filed a notice of appeal and
23	motion for a stay pending appeal. ECF No. 116. On August 28, 2014, the court issued an order	
24	granting the motion for a stay in part. ECF No. 133. That order provided, in relevant part,	
25	Retrial of petitioner is stayed during the pendency of respondent's	
26	appeal from the judgment entered in this action. If the appeal is unsuccessful, the State of California shall have thirty (30) days	
27	from the date the appellate proceedings in State court.	e decision is final to institute trial
28	ECF No. 132.	
		1

1	The Ninth Circuit affirmed this court's decision to grant the petition for a writ of	
2	habeas corpus. ECF No. 159. On August 21, 2015, the circuit court's mandate issued, and its	
3	judgment took effect and became final. ECF No. 160; see Fed. R. App. P. 41(c). The date "thirty	
4	(30) days from the date the appellate decision is final" was therefore September 21, 2015. See	
5	Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1).	
6	On September 16, 2015, the Sacramento County Superior Court set petitioner's	
7	case for trial on September 21, 2015. Req. Enf. Ex. C, at 2, ECF No. 164. On September 21,	
8	2015, the Superior Court received briefing from petitioner and respondent on the effect of this	
9	court's August 28, 2014 order, see id. Exs. A, B, and thereafter issued an order (1) finding the	
10	state had until October 20, 2015, to bring petitioner to trial, and (2) continuing the matter for a	
11	pretrial conference to September 23, 2015, see generally id. Ex. C.	
12	Petitioner argues the state has not complied with this court's August 28, 2014	
13	order. He argues a trial has not "commenced" until "the first witness is sworn or the first exhibit	
14	is admitted into evidence." Not. Anticipated Req. 2, ECF No. 161 (quoting Cal. Evid. Code	
15	§ 12(b)(1)). The court disagrees. The August 28, 2014 order required "trial proceedings" be	
16	instituted within thirty days, not "trial."	
17	The request is DENIED.	
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
19	DATED: September 24, 2015.	
20	MA Malla /	
21	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	