| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 7 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 8 | |
| 9 | JOSEPH P. GUTIERREZ, No. C 08-3906 SI (pr) |
| 10 | Petitioner, ORDER PERMITTING SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFS |
| 11 | V. |
| 12 | B. CURRY, |
| 13 | Respondent. |
| 14 | / |
| 15 | A recent en banc decision from the Ninth Circuit addressed important issues relating to federal |
| 16 | review of parole decisions, Hayward v Marshall, No. 06-55392, 2010 WL 1664977 (9th Cir. April 22, |
| 17 | 2010) (en banc). The court will provide each party an opportunity to submit a supplemental brief (not |
| 18 | to exceed 15 pages in length) explaining his views of how the <u>Hayward en banc</u> decision applies to this |
| 19 | parole denial habeas case. The court sets the following schedule: |
| 20 | 1. No later than May 10, 2010 , respondent must send to petitioner a copy of the <u>Hayward</u> |
| 21 | en banc decision. |
| 22 | 2. No later than May 28, 2010 , respondent must file and serve any supplemental brief on |
| 23 | the impact of <u>Hayward</u> on this action. |
| 24 | 3. No later than July 2, 2010 , petitioner must file and serve any supplemental brief on the |
| 25 | impact of <u>Hayward</u> on this action. |
| 26 | IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 27 | DATED: April 27, 2010 SUSAN ILLSTON |
| 28 | United States District Judge |
| | |