IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID G. LEONARD, No. 2:12-CV-2161-MCE-CMK-P

Petitioner,

vs. <u>ORDER</u>

JAMES HARTLEY,

Respondent.

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Pending before the court are: (1) petitioner's motion (Doc. 34) for an order permitting discovery; and (2) petitioner's motion (Doc. 52) for an extension of time to file a traverse.

Turning to petitioner's motion for discovery, petitioner seeks leave of court to conduct discovery on all of his claims. By way of example, plaintiff would like to discovery "[r]ecords relating to, or reflecting upon evidence seized, or introduced at trial, reliability of evidence, or pertaining to evidentiary matters or testimony." It is clear from his motion that petitioner is attempting to do exactly what the Supreme Court declared in <u>Cullen v. Pinholster</u>, 131 S.Ct. 1388 (2011), he cannot. Specifically, petitioner is attempting to use this federal habeas

action to fish for evidence to support his claims. Notably, petitioner has made no showing regarding his efforts, if any, to investigate the factual bases of his claims when they were pending before the state courts. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(2)(A)(ii). The court concludes that petitioner has failed to demonstrate good cause for an order allowing discovery. See Rule 6(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.

Petitioner seeks an extension of time (Doc. 52) to file a traverse. Good cause appearing therefor, the request will be granted.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Petitioner's motion for leave to conduct discovery (Doc. 34) is denied;
- 2. Petitioner's motion for an extension of time (Doc. 52) to file a traverse is granted; and
 - 3. Petitioner may file a traverse within 30 days of the date of this order.

DATED: February 24, 2014

CRAIG M. KELLISON

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE