



1           The petition raises four claims and, despite my best efforts, I cannot understand either  
2 their substance or the relation between them. The first claim involves disputes with petitioner’s  
3 defense attorney and petitioner’s attempts to represent himself. ECF No. 1 at 5. But I cannot  
4 discern the nature of petitioner’s disputes with counsel or why he believes that his constitutional  
5 rights were violated. The second claim relates to a prison disciplinary citation, which petitioner  
6 refers to as a “disciplinary,” which petitioner received in 2016. *Id.* at 7. I can understand neither  
7 the context of the “disciplinary” nor its relation to the 2018 conviction. The third claim  
8 references a sealed capital charge in Kern County Superior Court. *Id.* at 8. Petitioner states that  
9 he is challenging a 2018 conviction that was obtained in Amador County, *id.* at 1, and his  
10 allegations do not explain how the sealed Kern County charge is relevant. Finally, petitioner  
11 argues that “respondent has invoked into a sealed plea bargain agreement opposing liberty  
12 interest.” *Id.* at 10. Petitioner goes on to reference a 1982 conviction, but does not explain either  
13 the meaning or relevance of this claim. The exhibits that petitioner has attached shed little light  
14 on the foregoing claims. Most are comprised of prison disciplinary and grievance documents.  
15 There is a state appellate opinion, ECF No. 1-3 at 22, but the claims in the immediate petition  
16 bear no relation to the issues discussed by the California appellate opinion.

17           The petition, in its current form, is not comprehensible to me, and I do not expect that it  
18 would be to the respondent, either, were he to be served. At this point, it thus plainly appears that  
19 petitioner is not entitled to relief. *See Greenway v. Schriro*, 653 F.3d 790, 804 (9th Cir. 2011)  
20 (holding that “cursory and vague claim[s] cannot support habeas relief”). Petitioner may file an  
21 amended petition within sixty days of this order’s entry.

22           It is ORDERED that:

- 23           1.       Petitioner’s application to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 11, is granted.
- 24           2.       Petitioner may file an amended petition within sixty days of this order’s entry. If  
25 he does not, I will recommend that the current petition be dismissed for the reasons stated in this  
26 order.
- 27           3.       The Clerk of Court is directed to send petitioner a federal habeas form.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 2, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEREMY D. PETERSON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE