21

22

23

24

25

26

DISCUSSION

Petitioner cannot present his ineffective assistance of counsel claim to this court until the claim has been fairly presented to the California Supreme Court. It does not appear that the pro se petitioner seeks to stay these proceedings for an improper purpose. Nor does it appear that petitioner has engaged in abusive litigation tactics or intentional delay. Moreover, respondent does not oppose petitioner's motion, and if petitioner obtains relief in state court, his

Doc. 19

1 federal petition may be rendered moot, thereby serving the interests of judicial economy as well 2 as the interests of justice. Accordingly, good cause appearing, the court will grant petitioner's 3 renewed motion for a stay and abeyance pursuant to the procedure set forth in Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269 (2005). 4 5 CONCLUSION 6 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 7 1. Petitioner's renewed motion for a stay and abeyance (Doc. No. 11) is granted; 8 2. Petitioner shall present any unexhausted claims to the California Supreme 9 Court in a further state habeas corpus petition to be filed within thirty days if he has not done so 10 already; 11 3. This action is stayed and the Clerk of the Court is directed to administratively 12 close the case; 13 4. Petitioner shall file and serve a status report in this case on the first court day of each month; and 14 15 5. Petitioner shall file and serve a motion to lift the stay of this action, along with 16 a proposed second amended petition containing only exhausted claims, within thirty days after 17 petitioner is served with the California Supreme Court's order disposing of the state exhaustion 18 petition. 19 DATED: May 3, 2012. 20 ale A. Dogod 21 22 DAD:9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE broo1637.sty 23 24 25

26