(HC) Poplar v. Biter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA NATHANIEL POPLAR, 10 11 Petitioner, No. 2: 12-cv-1368 JAM KJN P 12 VS. 13 M. BITER, Respondent. 14 **ORDER** 15 16 Petitioner is a state prisoner, proceeding without counsel, with a petition for writ 17 of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On November 21, 2012, respondent filed an 18 answer to the petition. On December 17, 2012, petitioner filed a reply to the answer. The 19 petition is now submitted for decision. On September 26, 2012, petitioner filed a "motion counter claims Federal Rules 20 21 of Civil Procedure, Rule 13." In this motion, petitioner requests that the criminal charges against 22 him be dismissed because the state court lacked jurisdiction. In particular, petitioner argues that 23 there was insufficient evidence to support the gang enhancement based on his statement to the victim, "My kids got to eat." The court construes petitioner's September 26, 2012 motion as 24 25 further briefing in support of his claim alleging insufficient evidence to support the gang

enhancement. The court will consider the arguments raised in petitioner's September 26, 2012

26

Doc. 22

motion at the time it considers the merits of the petition. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's September 26, 2012 motion of counter claims (Dkt. No. 14) is construed as further briefing in support of the petition. DATED: April 11, 2013 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE pop1368.ord