On October 27, 2014, petitioner commenced this action by filing a new petition for writ of habeas corpus. ECF No. 1. The petition also challenges the disciplinary conviction arising out of the May 2, 2013 rules violation report. "[W]here a new pro se petition is filed before the adjudication of a prior petition is complete, the new petition should be construed as a motion to amend the pending petition rather than as a successive application." *Woods v. Carey*, 525 F.3d 886, 888-890 (9th Cir. 2008).

25

26

27

28

	il de la companya de
1	In this case, the petition filed in the first action has not been adjudicated. Therefore, the
2	court will construe the instant petition as a motion to amend the previously-filed petition.
3	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
4	1. The Clerk of the Court shall file the petition (ECF No. 1) in Case No. 2:14-cv-2497-
5	TLN-GGH as a motion to amend;
6	2. The Clerk shall file a copy of this order in Case No. 2:14-cv-2497-TLN-GGH and
7	close this case; and
8	3. Petitioner is instructed that all future pleadings should be identified by the case
9	number: 2:14-cv-2497-TLN-GGH.
10	DATED: March 10, 2015.
11	EDMUND F. BRENNAN
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26 27	
27	