

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL A. COX,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-04-0065 MCE CKD

vs.

DEATH PENALTY CASE

WARDEN, San Quentin
State Prison,

Respondent.

ORDER

_____ /

On October 31, 2011, petitioner filed his traverse and a motion for discovery. (Dkt. Nos. 102, 103.). In addition to hearing argument on petitioner’s discovery motion, on December 14, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.,¹ the court will conduct a scheduling conference. In his opposition to petitioner’s discovery motion, respondent shall include a proposed schedule for addressing upcoming issues, including the procedural defenses raised in the answer, the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d), discovery, any motion for an evidentiary hearing, and the merits of petitioner’s claims. In his reply brief, petitioner shall include a response to respondent’s proposals and, to the extent he disagrees, make new proposals. The parties

_____ ¹ While petitioner noticed his motion for 9:00 a.m. on December 14, 2011, the court’s civil calendar begins at 10:00 a.m.

1 scheduling proposals shall specifically reference the effect of Cullen v. Pinholster, 131 S. Ct.
2 1388 (2011) on all aspects of this proceeding.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: November 9, 2011

5 
6 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10 cox sch.or

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26