

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**

RALPH E. DUMONT,
Petitioner,

No. 2:13-CV-2541-CMK-P

vs.

ORDER

JEROME PRICE, et al.,
Respondents.

_____ /

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner commenced this action with a petition (Doc. 1) followed by numerous separately filed supplements and exhibits (see Docs. 7, 13, 17, 18, 20, and 21). On February 24, 2014, the court dismissed petitioner’s petition and directed petitioner to file an amended petition within 30 days naming the correct respondent. Petitioner was cautioned that his amended petition must state all claims and requests for relief. Petitioner was also warned that failure to file an amended petition may result in dismissal of this action for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110.

Petitioner then filed a first amended petition (Doc. 23) followed again by separately filed supplements (see Docs. 25, 26, 28, and 30). On July 25, 2014, the court dismissed the first amended petition and struck from the docket the various supplements. Petitioner was once again directed to file an amended petition naming the proper respondent as well as stating all claims and providing all supporting documents and exhibits in a single

1 pleading. As with the court's previous order, petitioner was also again cautioned that failure to
2 comply could result in dismissal of the action. See Local Rule 110.

3 Petitioner filed his next amended petition on August 22, 2014 (Doc. 34). As
4 before, petitioner followed this filing with separately filed supplements (see Docs. 36 and 37).
5 Once again, by order issued on October 30, 2014, the court dismissed the amended petition,
6 struck the various supplements, and directed petitioner to file an amended petitioner containing
7 all claims and supporting evidence in a single pleading. Again, petitioner was warned that failure
8 to comply could result in dismissal of the action under the court's local rules. Petitioner
9 thereafter sought and was granted two extensions of time.

10 Petitioner filed his most recent amended petition, this time naming the correct
11 respondent, on February 6, 2015 (Doc. 42). Three weeks later petitioner filed supporting exhibits
12 (Doc. 44). In light of the foregoing procedural history, it appears that petitioner is unwilling to
13 comply with the court's clear directive, repeated on several occasions, to include all supporting
14 documents and exhibits with his petition in a single pleading. Petitioner shall show cause in
15 writing, within 30 days of the date of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for
16 failure to comply with court rules and orders. Petitioner is again warned that failure to respond
17 to this order may result in dismissal of the action for the reasons outlined above, as well as for
18 failure to prosecute. See Local Rule 110.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20
21 DATED: July 23, 2015

22 
23 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25
26