1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	RICHARD J. LEWIS,				
11	Petitioner, No. 2:06-cv-0481 MCE KJN P				
12	VS.				
13	M. VEAL, Warden, et al.,				
14	Desman dents ODDED				
14	Respondents. <u>ORDER</u>				
14 15	/				
	On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition				
15	/				
15 16	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition				
15 16 17	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff				
15 16 17 18	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's				
15 16 17 18 19	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's order and clarified that this action remains viable because plaintiff could still benefit by a				
15 16 17 18 19 20	On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's order and clarified that this action remains viable because plaintiff could still benefit by a favorable ruling that may result in the shortening of his parole. Dkt. No. 32. The court agrees.				
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's order and clarified that this action remains viable because plaintiff could still benefit by a favorable ruling that may result in the shortening of his parole. Dkt. No. 32. The court agrees. See U.S. Const., Art. III, § 2; Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998).				
<ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's order and clarified that this action remains viable because plaintiff could still benefit by a favorable ruling that may result in the shortening of his parole. Dkt. No. 32. The court agrees. See U.S. Const., Art. III, § 2; Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998).				
<ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's order and clarified that this action remains viable because plaintiff could still benefit by a favorable ruling that may result in the shortening of his parole. Dkt. No. 32. The court agrees. See U.S. Const., Art. III, § 2; Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998). //// ////				
<ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's order and clarified that this action remains viable because plaintiff could still benefit by a favorable ruling that may result in the shortening of his parole. Dkt. No. 32. The court agrees. See U.S. Const., Art. III, § 2; Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998). //// //// ////				
<ol> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	/ On February 16, 2010, this court directed plaintiff to show cause why his petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should not be discharged because plaintiff was paroled on November 5, 2009. Dkt. No. 31. Plaintiff has timely responded to the court's order and clarified that this action remains viable because plaintiff could still benefit by a favorable ruling that may result in the shortening of his parole. Dkt. No. 32. The court agrees. See U.S. Const., Art. III, § 2; Spencer v. Kemna, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998). //// //// //// //// ////				

Accordingly, good cause having been shown, the order to show cause is HEREBY DISCHARGED. This court notes that this case is fully briefed and will be decided in due course. DATED: March 29, 2010 

**KEND** 

ALL J. NEWMAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

lewi0481.disch.osc

22	
23	
24	