2254(b)(2).

1083, 1086 (9th Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 478 U.S. 1021 (1986).

After reviewing the petition for habeas corpus, 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. Accordingly, the petition should be dismissed without prejudice.²

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:
- 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district judge to this action; 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 are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." If petitioner files objections, he shall also address whether a certificate of appealability should issue and, if so, why and as to which issues. A certificate of appealability may issue under 28 U.S.C. § 2253 "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C.

22 ///

23 ////

24 ////

² 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	§ 2253(c)(3). Any response to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen days after
2	service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the
3	specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951
4	F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
5	Dated: May 15, 2017
6	Ferdal O. Newman
7	KENDALL J. NEWMAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8	
9	Dot874.dis
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	