I

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	ANTONIO VENTURA,
11	Petitioner, No. CIV S-09-1873 MCE KJM P
12	VS.
13	D.K. SISTO, et al.,
14	Respondents. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
15 16	/ Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of
	/ Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this
16	
16 17	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this
16 17 18	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> . The <u>en</u>
16 17 18 19	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> . The <u>en</u> <u>banc</u> decision has issued: <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> , 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore,
16 17 18 19 20	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> . The <u>en</u> <u>banc</u> decision has issued: <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> , 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, respondents' request for a stay (#13) is denied as unnecessary at this time, and their response to
16 17 18 19 20 21	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> . The <u>en</u> <u>banc</u> decision has issued: <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> , 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, respondents' request for a stay (#13) is denied as unnecessary at this time, and their response to petitioner's application for writ of habeas corpus is due within thirty days. <u>See</u> January 13, 2010
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> . The <u>en</u> <u>banc</u> decision has issued: <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> , 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, respondents' request for a stay (#13) is denied as unnecessary at this time, and their response to petitioner's application for writ of habeas corpus is due within thirty days. <u>See</u> January 13, 2010 order.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u>. The <u>en banc</u> decision has issued: <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u>, 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, respondents' request for a stay (#13) is denied as unnecessary at this time, and their response to petitioner's application for writ of habeas corpus is due within thirty days. <u>See</u> January 13, 2010 order. DATED: August 16, 2010.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u>. The <u>en banc</u> decision has issued: <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u>, 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, respondents' request for a stay (#13) is denied as unnecessary at this time, and their response to petitioner's application for writ of habeas corpus is due within thirty days. <u>See</u> January 13, 2010 order. DATED: August 16, 2010.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 15, 2010, respondent requested that this matter be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's <u>en banc</u> decision in <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> . The <u>en</u> <u>banc</u> decision has issued: <u>Hayward v. Marshall</u> , 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010). Therefore, respondents' request for a stay (#13) is denied as unnecessary at this time, and their response to petitioner's application for writ of habeas corpus is due within thirty days. <u>See</u> January 13, 2010 order. DATED: August 16, 2010. U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE