1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 11 12 13 ERIK SANFORD CHATMAN, Case No. C 07-0640 WHA 14 Petitioner, **DEATH PENALTY CASE** 15 v. PROPOSED| ORDER REGARDING 16 PROCEDURAL MATTERS RELATED TO THE MIXED FINALIZED PETITION 17 KEVIN CHAPPELL, Warden of California (DOC. 41) State Prison at San Quentin, 18 Respondent. 19 20 21 Based upon the stipulation of the parties, the Court adopts their proposed schedule for 22 resolving procedural matters related to the mixed finalized petition. 1. Within 30 days of the issuance of this Order, respondent shall file a motion to dismiss 23 24 the mixed petition. See O'Bremski v. Maass, 915 F.2d 418, 420 (9th Cir. 1990); see also Rose v. 25 Lundy, 455 U.S. 509, 522 (1982) (holding that for reasons of comity and federalism, district 26 courts may not adjudicate mixed petitions). 2. Within 45 days of the filing of respondent's motion to dismiss the mixed petition, 27 28 petitioner shall file his response and his motion for a stay so that he may present his unexhausted 1 [Proposed] Order Regarding Procedural Matters Related to the Mixed Finalized Petition (Doc. 41) (C 07-0640 WHA)

| 1 | claims to the state court. See Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269, 273-78 (2005) (affirming the | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | authority of district courts to stay, rather than dismiss, mixed petitions governed by AEDPA | | | | |
| 3 | deadlines); see also Kelly v. Small, 315 F.3d 1063 (9th Cir. 2002). | | | | |
| 4 | 3. Within 14 days of petitioner filing his response to the motion to dismiss and motion for a | | | | |
| 5 | stay, respondent shall file any reply to the response to the motion to dismiss and his response to | | | | |
| 6 | the motion for a stay. | | | | |
| 7 | 4. Within 14 days of respondent's reply/response to the motion for a stay, petitioner shall | | | | |
| 8 | file any reply to the response to the motion for a stay. | | | | |
| 9 | 5. The above motions will be decided on the pleadings. | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | | | |
| 12 | DATED: July 23, 2013 , 2013. | | | | |
| 13 | Mª Phy | | | | |
| 14 | WILLIAM H. ALSUP | | | | |
| 15 | United States District Judge | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | 20704304.doc | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | 2 | | | | |
| | 11 | | | | |

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

| Case Name: | Chatman v. Chappell, Warden (Death Penalty Case) | No. | C 07-0640 WHA | | |
|--|--|-----|---------------|--|--|
| I hereby certify that on <u>July 9, 2013</u> , I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system: | | | | | |
| 1. JOINT STATEMENT STIPULATING TO A PROPOSED SCHEDULE; and | | | | | |
| 2. [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PROCEDURAL MATTERS RELATED TO THE MIXED FINALIZED PETITION (DOC. 41) | | | | | |
| I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system. | | | | | |
| I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on <u>July 9, 2013</u> , at San Francisco, California. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | E. Rios | | /s/ E. Rios | | |
| | Declarant | | Signature | | |

20708918.doc