1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHRISTOPHER D. THOMPSON,	No. 2:13-cv-0747 AC P
12	Petitioner,	
13	v.	ORDER
14	SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL COURT,	
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	Petitioner is a state prisoner who proceeds pro se on his petition for writ of habeas corpus	
18	filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On April 23, 2013, the court directed petitioner to submit	
19	within 30 days an appropriate application to proceed in forma pauperis, or to pay the filing fee.	
20	To date, petitioner has done neither. Instead, he has filed: (1) a letter, dated May 10, 2013,	
21	advising the court that he gave his form to a counselor, and has not yet received it back; and (2) a	
22	request for clarification, asking why he has received a second information packet for signature.	
23	The court will address each of petitioner's inquiries in turn.	
24	Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis	
25	In order to proceed on the filed habeas petition, petitioner must either pay the filing fee	
26	(\$5.00), or file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The court specifically advised petitioner of	
27	this requirement in its April 23, 2013 order. To date petitioner has failed to comply, instead	
28	advising the court that, as of May 10, 2013, he has given the form to a counselor but not yet	
		1

received the form back. He further asks if his submission of the consent form will allow him to
 proceed.

Petitioner is advised that his decision to consent to the jurisdiction of the undersigned is distinct from his obligation to pay the fee, or to file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The court will accordingly construe the May 10, 2013 letter as a request for an extension of time to comply with the court's April 23, 2013 order. Petitioner shall have 30 days from the filing date of this order either to pay the filing fee, or to file a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis. Failure of petitioner to comply may result in dismissal of the petitioner without prejudice.

10

14

Request for Clarification

In his request for clarification, petitioner asks why he has been sent a new information
packet with a new case number. He also writes that he has sent "the original plus two copies,"
and asks what he is supposed to do, since he has already complied with the court's order.

A review of the court's records reflects the following:

(1) On April 17, 2013, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus, signed
and dated April 4, 2013, challenging a February 1, 2013 conviction in
Sacramento Municipal Court. This petition was assigned case number 2:13cv-0747, and was assigned to Judge Claire; and
(2) On May 15, 2013, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus, signed

## and dated April 23, 2013, challenging a February 1, 2013 conviction in Sacramento Municipal Court. This petition was assigned case number 2:13cv-0964 and assigned to Judge Drozd.

In short, the reason why petitioner has received two information packets, and two case numbers,
is because he had filed two petitions. Petitioner is reminded that, if he wishes to pursue both
cases, he must comply with the orders issued in each case. If petitioner did not intend to initiate

two distinct proceedings, he may dismiss his later-filed case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41.

- 27 In accordance with the above, IT IS ACCORDINGLY ORDERED that
- 28

1. Petitioner's May 15, 2013 letter (ECF No. 5) is construed as a request for an

1	extension of time to comply with the court's April 23, 2013 order, and, so construed is
2	granted;
3	2. Within 30 days of the filing date of this order, petitioner shall submit an affidavit in
4	support of his request to proceed in forma pauperis, or the appropriate filing fee,
5	failing which the action may be dismissed without prejudice; and
6	3. Petitioner's request for clarification (ECF No. 6) is granted, as above.
7	DATED: June 12, 2013 allon Clane
8	
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	3
	J. J