Case 2:06-cv-01762-LKK-GGH Document 4 Page 1 of 3 Filed 08/17/2006 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JERRY MICHAEL SMITH, 10 11 Petitioner, No. CIV S-06-1762 LKK GGH P 12 VS. 13 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., 14 ORDER Respondents. 15 16 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with an 17 application for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. 18 Examination of the in forma pauperis affidavit reveals that petitioner is unable to 19 afford the costs of suit. Accordingly, the request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis will be 20 granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Since petitioner may be entitled to the requested relief if the claimed violation of 21 22 constitutional rights is proved, respondents will be served with the petition, but shall not file a 23 response at the present time. 24 In light of the length of petitioner's sentence, the court has determined that the 25 interests of justice require appointment of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B); see also 26 Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). 1

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
2	1. Petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis is granted;
3	2. The Federal Defender is appointed to represent petitioner;
4	3. Within thirty days of this order, the parties shall file a joint scheduling
5	statement which addresses the timing and order of the following matters:
6	a. The number of days petitioner's counsel estimates it will take to file
7	either:
8	1. A statement indicating petitioner will stand on the existing
9	petition, and supplemental memorandum of points and authorities, if any;
10	2. An amended petition which will proceed on exhausted claims
11	only; or
12	3. An amended petition which identifies both exhausted and
13	unexhausted claims, demonstrates good cause for having failed to exhaust state court
14	remedies as to any claims, and any intention to pursue unexhausted claims, after which the
15	court may recommend that the proceedings be held in abeyance while petitioner exhausts any
16	new claims in state court.
17	b. Discovery and investigations;
18	c. Anticipated motions;
19	d. The need for and timing of an evidentiary hearing;
20	e. Enumeration and resolution of unexhausted claims; and
21	f. Possible future amendments to the pleadings.
22	Counsel are reminded of the importance of timely filing a joint scheduling statement. Failure to
23	do so may result in sanctions.
24	
25	
,,	1 D1 '

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269, 125 S. Ct. 1528 (2005).

## 

4. The Clerk of the Court shall serve a copy of this order on Stanley Cross, Acting Senior Assistant Attorney General, and David Porter, Assistant Federal Defender. DATED: 8/17/06 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows GREGORY G. HOLLOWS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE GGH:bb smit1762.110ggh