1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JEFF WREN,
11	Petitioner, No. 2:10-cv-1924 KJN P
12	VS.
13	JAMES A. YATES, ORDER AND
14	Respondent. <u>FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
15	/
16	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel with a petition for writ of
17	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On November 4, 2010, respondent filed a request
18	to consolidate cases. Respondent points out that petitioner has filed two separate petitions
19	challenging his 2008 conviction for felony driving under the influence of alcohol with two prior
20	strike convictions. Respondent seeks consolidation of these two actions.
21	Comparison of the original petition filed in 2:10-cv-1735 MCE EFB P^1 and the
22	original petition filed in this action reveals each petition is a duplicate of the other. It appears a
23	second habeas action was opened using a photocopy or second handwritten copy of the original
24	
25	¹ A court may take judicial notice of court records. <u>See MGIC Indem. Co. v. Weisman</u> ,
26	803 F.2d 500, 505 (9th Cir. 1986); <u>United States v. Wilson</u> , 631 F.2d 118, 119 (9th Cir. 1980).

1

petition.² Both petitions raise the same claims. The only difference between the petitions is the
 number of pages of exhibits is different. The total pages filed in 2:10-cv-1735 MCE EFB P is
 188 pages, where the total pages filed in the instant action is 192 pages.³

Moreover, review of the third amended petition filed in the instant action, required to supplant the name of the proper respondent, reveals that the only difference between the third amended petition and the original petition is the interlineation of James A. Yates, Warden, as respondent.

B Due to the duplicative nature of the present action, the court will deny the motion
for reconsideration and recommend that the instant petition be dismissed. Other than objections
to these findings and recommendations, all further filings related to the petition challenging the
2008 conviction shall be filed in 2:10-cv-1735 MCE EFB P.⁴

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that

1. Respondent's November 4, 2010 motion to consolidate cases is denied; and

4

5

6

7

12

13

14

15

21

2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case.

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without

16 prejudice. <u>See</u> Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twentyone days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned

Petitioner's actions were initially filed in the Fresno Division of the Eastern District and subsequently transferred to this division. See 1:10-cv-1160 JLT and 1:10-cv-1171 SKO.

³ Both parties have benefit of both sets of exhibits. If either party wishes to have exhibits submitted in the instant action filed in Case No. 2:10-cv-1735 MCE EFB P, party may request it.

 ⁴ Pursuant to the October 27, 2010 order, petitioner must response to respondent's September 22, 2010 motion to dismiss within 21 days from the date of that order. <u>Id.</u>, Dkt. No. 16.

"Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the
 objections shall be filed and served within fourteen days after service of the objections. The
 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to
 appeal the District Court's order. <u>Martinez v. Ylst</u>, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
 DATED: November 9, 2010

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 wren1924.dm