

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 KENNETH ALLEN SHARANOFF,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
15 CALIFORNIA, et al.,

16 Respondents.
17

No. 2:15-cv-0389 CKD P

ORDER AND

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

18 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas
19 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis.

20 Examination of the in forma pauperis affidavit reveals that petitioner is unable to afford
21 the costs of suit. Accordingly, the request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is granted. See
22 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). The court must now determine if the action is frivolous or malicious.

23 In considering whether to dismiss an action as frivolous pursuant to § 1915(d), the court
24 has especially broad discretion. Conway v. Fugge, 439 F.2d 1397 (9th Cir. 1971). The Ninth
25 Circuit has held that an action is frivolous if it lacks arguable substance in law and fact. Franklin
26 v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1227-28 (9th Cir. 1984). The court's determination of whether a
27 complaint or claim is frivolous is based on "an assessment of the substance of the claim
28 presented, i.e., is there a factual and legal basis, of constitutional dimension, for the asserted

1 wrong, however inartfully pleaded.” Franklin, 745 F.2d at 1227 (citations omitted).

2 The instant petition was filed with the court on February 11, 2015. Court records reveal
3 that on April 18, 2013, petitioner filed a petition challenging the same 2010 murder conviction as
4 in this action. Sharanoff v. Warden, No. 2:13-cv-0794 TLN AC (E.D. Cal.).¹ That action is
5 currently pending. Due to the duplicative nature of the present action, the court finds it frivolous
6 and, therefore, will dismiss the petition. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d).

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall assign a district
8 judge to this action.

9 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See
10 Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

11 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the District Judge assigned to this
12 case pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served
13 with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written objections with the court.
14 The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and
15 Recommendations.” Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time
16 may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th
17 Cir. 1991).

18 Dated: April 2, 2015

19 
20 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23

24 2 / shar0389.123
25
26

27 _____
28 ¹ A court may take judicial notice of court records. See MGIC Indem. Co. v. Weisman, 803 F.2d
500, 505 (9th Cir. 1986); United States v. Wilson, 631 F.2d 118, 119 (9th Cir. 1980).