

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KENNETH A. SHARONOFF,
Petitioner,
v.
WARDEN,
Respondent.

No. 2:13-cv-0794 TLN AC P

ORDER

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has filed a motion for “dispos[ition] of all claims as to all parties” and “final judgment of issu[e]s and claims.”¹ See ECF No. 74. Petitioner’s request for “disposition of all claims” appears to be a response to the order of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissing petitioner’s interlocutory appeal, ECF No. 66, for lack of jurisdiction on the ground that the orders petitioner attempted to appeal were not final or appealable. See ECF No. 70 (Ninth Circuit Order).

////

¹ Attached to petitioner’s motion are a number of documents, including orders issued by this court, state court documents, and annotated copies of the transcripts from petitioner’s trial. See id. at 3-117. With the exception of the court orders, it appears that the majority of these documents have previously been submitted to this court by petitioner as attachments to his petition for habeas corpus and other motions.

1 Petitioner’s “motion for disposition of all claims” will be granted to the extent that this
2 court will issue findings and recommendations, in a separate order, addressing the merits of the
3 claims raised in the petition for writ of habeas corpus. In all other respects, the motion will be
4 denied.


5 Petitioner has also filed a document entitled “Article 440 Motion.” See ECF No. 75 at 1.
6 This filing consists of an assortment of documents that petitioner contends explain why his
7 conviction was wrong or unfair, and how his constitutional rights were violated. See id. at 3.
8 Based on the court’s review of these documents, it appears that these documents or their
9 equivalents have already been submitted to the court as part of petitioner’s prior filings.

10 To the extent petitioner’s “Article 440 motion” may be construed as a request for relief,
11 the motion is denied. Petitioner is advised that his claims for relief will be addressed in a separate
12 order. Petitioner need not submit any additional documents to the court in order for the court to
13 address the merits of his habeas petition.

14 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 15 1. Petitioner’s motion for disposition of all claims (ECF No. 74) is granted in part and
16 denied in part. It is granted to the extent that a separate order will issue addressing the
17 merits of the claims raised in petitioner’s petition for writ of habeas corpus. In all
18 other respects, the motion is denied.
- 19 2. Petitioner’s “Article 440 Motion” (ECF No. 75) is denied.

20 DATED: September 30, 2016

21 
22 ALLISON CLAIRE
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28