

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARCELL WILLIAMS,
Petitioner,
v.
TIMOTHY FILSON,
Respondent.

No. 2:18-cv-1305 KJM KJN P

ORDER

Petitioner is a state prisoner, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. This case was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262. On May 28, 2019, petitioner filed a document styled, “Motion to Clarify Record.” (ECF No. 19.) Petitioner’s motion is not clear, but it appears that petitioner wishes to add in claims that were previously dismissed as unexhausted.¹ However, petitioner has not demonstrated that he has exhausted such claims.²

¹ Earlier in this case, petitioner filed a motion for stay. On September 17, 2018, the undersigned recommended that petitioner’s motion for stay be denied, and petitioner be ordered to file an amended petition raising only his exhausted claims (1) and (5). Petitioner did not file objections to the findings and recommendations. On March 9, 2019, the district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full. This action now proceeds on petitioner’s amended petition.

² Indeed, the only filing in the California Supreme Court was the petition for review filed in Case No. S143801 on May 30, 2006, and denied on July 12, 2006. People v. Williams, S143801 (Cal.) The court may take judicial notice of facts that are “not subject to reasonable dispute because it . . . can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be

