

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

REGINALD BLOUNT,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-08-1395 GGH P

vs.

SACRAMENTO DISTRICT COURT, et al.,

Respondents.

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. Petitioner has responded to the court’s October 24, 2008, order to show cause why this action should not be dismissed pursuant to the Younger doctrine.

The court recommends that this action be dismissed because petitioner is challenging ongoing criminal proceedings. Under principles of comity and federalism, a federal court should not interfere with ongoing state criminal proceedings by granting injunctive or declaratory relief absent extraordinary circumstances. See Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971). Younger abstention is required when 1) state proceedings, judicial in nature, are pending; 2) state proceedings involve important state interests; and 3) the state proceedings afford adequate opportunity to raise the constitutional issue. See Middlesex County Ethic

