

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

THOMAS L. WILSON,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S 07-2294 FCD KJM P

vs.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS & REHABILITATION,

Respondent.

ORDER AND

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_  
Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Petitioner has submitted a declaration that makes the showing required by § 1915(a). Accordingly, the request to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

The exhaustion of state court remedies is a prerequisite to the granting of a petition for writ of habeas corpus. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1). If exhaustion is to be waived, it must be waived explicitly by respondent’s counsel. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(3).<sup>1</sup> A waiver of exhaustion, thus, may not be implied or inferred. A petitioner satisfies the exhaustion requirement by

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> A petition may be denied on the merits without exhaustion of state court remedies. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2).

1 providing the highest state court with a full and fair opportunity to consider all claims before  
2 presenting them to the federal court. Picard v. Connor, 404 U.S. 270, 276 (1971); Middleton v.  
3 Cupp, 768 F.2d 1083, 1086 (9th Cir. 1986).

4           After reviewing the petition for habeas corpus, the court finds that petitioner has  
5 failed to exhaust state court remedies. Although petitioner has sought habeas review from the  
6 superior court, he has not presented his claims to the California Supreme Court. Further, there is  
7 no allegation that state court remedies are no longer available to petitioner. Accordingly, the  
8 petition should be dismissed without prejudice.<sup>2</sup>

9           Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10           1. Petitioner is granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis (docket no. 2); and  
11           2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to serve a copy of these findings and  
12 recommendations together with a copy of the petition filed in the instant case on the Attorney  
13 General of the State of California.

14           IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that petitioner's application for a writ of  
15 habeas corpus be dismissed for failure to exhaust state court remedies.

16 /////

17 /////

18 /////

19 /////

20 /////

21 /////

22 /////

---

23  
24           <sup>2</sup> Petitioner is cautioned that the habeas corpus statute imposes a one year statute of  
25 limitations for filing non-capital habeas corpus petitions in federal court. In most cases, the one  
26 year period will start to run on the date on which the state court judgment became final by the  
conclusion of direct review or the expiration of time for seeking direct review, although the  
statute of limitations is tolled while a properly filed application for state post-conviction or other  
collateral review is pending. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

1           These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States  
2 District Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within  
3 twenty days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file  
4 written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Findings  
5 and Recommendations." Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified  
6 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153  
7 (9th Cir. 1991).

8 DATED: February 1, 2008.

9   
10 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 2  
12 wils2294.103

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