

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADRIAN FRANK ANDRADE,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
MATTHEW CATE,  
Respondent.

No. 2:09-CV-02270 KJM AC P

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding with an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In several pleadings filed with the court, petitioner has complained about the adequacy of retained counsel’s representation of him in the instant case. See ECF Nos. 22, 30, 33. In fact, this court granted petitioner’s motion for relief from judgment based on petitioner’s contention that retained habeas counsel had abandoned him and failed to inform him that his § 2254 petition had been denied by this court on January 18, 2012. See ECF No. 24 (order granting 60(b) motion). Despite the re-opening of this case on grounds of retained counsel’s abandonment, counsel has continued to file pleadings in this case on petitioner’s behalf. See ECF No. 32 (supplemental reply). While this court is reticent to interfere in attorney-client relationships, the court’s ongoing questions concerning the status of counsel in the pending proceeding preclude it from ruling on pro se motions filed by petitioner.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Counsel for petitioner shall BOTH file a response to this order indicating whether they

1 intend to file a notice of withdrawal or whether they intend to continue to represent petitioner  
2 notwithstanding the conflict of interest described in this court's order of September 24, 2013.  
3 Such response shall be filed NO LATER THAN SEVEN DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THIS  
4 ORDER.

5           2. Counsel is further directed to serve a copy of the following documents on petitioner  
6 and to file proof of such service with the court within seven days of this order: 1) the 28 U.S.C.  
7 § 2254 petition (ECF No. 1); 2) the Answer (ECF No. 11); 3) the Reply (ECF No. 15); 4) the  
8 Findings and Recommendations (ECF No. 19); 5) the Order (ECF No. 20); 6) the Answer (ECF  
9 No. 31); and, 7) the Supplemental Reply (ECF No. 32).

10 DATED: June 11, 2014

11   
12 ALLISON CLAIRE  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28