28

2254(b)(2).

the federal court. <u>Picard v. Connor</u>, 404 U.S. 270, 276 (1971); <u>Middleton v. Cupp</u>, 768 F.2d 1083, 1086 (9th Cir. 1985), <u>cert. denied</u>, 478 U.S. 1021 (1986).

After reviewing the third amended petition for habeas corpus, <sup>2</sup> the court finds that petitioner has failed to exhaust state court remedies. The claims have not been presented to the California Supreme Court. Further, there is no allegation that state court remedies are no longer available to petitioner. Should petitioner disagree with these findings, he should file objections and attach the California Supreme Court decision to his objections. Accordingly, the petition should be dismissed without prejudice.<sup>3</sup>

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Petitioner is granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis;
- 2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to serve a copy of these findings and recommendations together with a copy of the petition filed in the instant case on the Attorney General of the State of California; and

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

These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Findings and Recommendations." Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Petitioner has filed second and third amended petitions, and the court has reviewed the most recent amendment. The second amended petition states that petitioner sought review with the California Supreme Court, but is "awaiting result." (ECF No. 6 at 5.) The third amended petition states that petitioner did not seek review by the state supreme court. (ECF No. 7 at 2, 6.)

Petitioner is cautioned that the habeas corpus statute imposes a one year statute of limitations for filing non-capital habeas corpus petitions in federal court. In most cases, the one 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).

1	may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th
2	Cir. 1991).
3	Dated: December 5, 2014
4	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	GGH:076
7	Pott2486.103
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	2