

1 respondent to file a response to the petition. In his motion, petitioner’s counsel states: “I believe
2 that this U.S. Magistrate Judge did not issue a specific order to counsel for the State of California
3 to reply specifically to the contents of the 28 U.S.C. 2254 petition. . . .” Contrary to counsel’s
4 belief, on October 24, 2018, the undersigned issued an order directing respondent to respond to
5 the petition, allowing respondent to either file a responsive motion or an answer under Rule 5 of
6 the Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner’s motion (ECF No. 17) is
8 denied.

9
10
11 Dated: June 5, 2019



DENNIS M. COTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28