

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

ROBIN GILLEN STARR,

Petitioner,

No. 2:12-cv-0083 KJN P

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

_____/

Petitioner has filed a motion for extension of time to file and serve a “traverse” in this action. However, there is no authority for filing a traverse at this time. A petitioner may file a traverse only if the respondent filed an answer to the petition. See Rule 5, Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, respondent filed a motion to dismiss petitioner’s habeas petition (Dkt. No. 43), and petitioner timely filed an opposition (Dkt. No. 46). The only briefing that remains is respondent’s optional reply brief. See Local Rule 230(1).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner’s motion for an extension of time (Dkt. No. 47), is denied.

DATED: December 12, 2012


KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

star0083.eot.wpd