

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

GARY L. BUNN,

Petitioner,

No. 2:13-cv-0438 CKD P

vs.

M. KAPLAN,

Respondent.

ORDER AND

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

_____/

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Petitioner has submitted a declaration that makes the showing required by § 1915(a). Accordingly, the request to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

The exhaustion of state court remedies is a prerequisite to the granting of a petition for writ of habeas corpus. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1). A petitioner satisfies the exhaustion requirement by providing the highest state court with a full and fair opportunity to consider all claims before presenting them to the federal court. Picard v. Connor, 404 U.S. 270, 276 (1971).

After reviewing the petition for habeas corpus, the court finds that petitioner has failed to exhaust state court remedies. The claims have not been presented to the California

1 Supreme Court. Further, there is no allegation that state court remedies are no longer available to
2 petitioner. Accordingly, the petition should be dismissed without prejudice.¹

3 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The Clerk of the Court assign a district court judge to this case; and
5 2. Petitioner is granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis;

6 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that petitioner's application for a writ of
7 habeas corpus be dismissed for failure to exhaust state court remedies.

8 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States
9 District Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within
10 fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file
11 written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Findings
12 and Recommendations." Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified
13 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153
14 (9th Cir. 1991).

15 Dated: April 1, 2013

16 
17 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19
20
21 ¹
22 bunn0438.103

23 _____
24 ¹ Petitioner is cautioned that the habeas corpus statute imposes a one year statute of
25 limitations for filing non-capital habeas corpus petitions in federal court. In most cases, the one
26 year period will start to run on the date on which the state court judgment became final by the
conclusion of direct review or the expiration of time for seeking direct review, although the
statute of limitations is tolled while a properly filed application for state post-conviction or other
collateral review is pending. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).