(HC) Turner v. Muniz 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ANTHONY R. TURNER, No. 2:13-cv-00454 WBS AC P 12 Petitioner. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 WILLIAM MUNIZ, Warden, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner is a state prisoner, proceeding with appointed counsel, in this habeas corpus action filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This action proceeds on petitioner's Second Amended 18 19 Petition. See ECF No. 54. By order filed August 9, 2016, this court directed petitioner to file his 20 traverse within thirty days after the California Supreme Court rules on his petition for review in 21 People v. Turner, California Supreme Court Case No. S232272. See ECF No. 75. That case 22 remains pending in the California Supreme Court.<sup>1</sup> 23 The California Supreme Court is holding Case No. S232272 pending a final decision in lead 24 case People v. Martinez, California Supreme Court Case No. S231826. The California Supreme Court filed a decision in Martinez on March 29, 2018, but a petition for rehearing or modification 25 remains pending. These matters are set forth on the respective dockets for these cases, available on the Case Information website operated by the California Courts. See http://appellatecases. 26 courtinfo.ca.gov/search. This court may take judicial notice of its own records and the records of other courts. See United States v. Howard, 381 F.3d 873, 876 n.1 (9th Cir. 2004); United States 27 v. Wilson, 631 F.2d 118, 119 (9th Cir. 1980); see also Fed. R. Evid. 201 (court may take judicial notice of facts that are capable of accurate determination by sources whose accuracy cannot 28 reasonably be questioned). 1

Doc. 77

1	On April 18, 2018, another judge in this district construed a pro se habeas petition filed by
2	petitioner in another case as a motion to amend the operative petition in this case. See ECF No.
3	76. The undersigned will not entertain a pro se motion to amend in this case, as petitioner is
4	represented by counsel. "A person represented by an attorney cannot file pro se motions."
5	<u>United States v. Gallardo</u> , 915 F. Supp. 216, 218 n.1 (D. Nev. 1995), aff'd, 92 F.3d 1194 (9th Cir.
6	1996).
7	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's pro se motion to amend, ECF
8	No. 76, is DENIED.
9	SO ORDERED.
10	DATED: April 19, 2018
11	ALLISON CLAIRE
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	
27	
28	
20	