

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 Northern District of California

E-Filed 4/7/10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

GARY BERNARD MOORE,

No. C 09-1634 RS (PR)

Petitioner,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

v.

ANTHONY HEDGPETH, Warden,

Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Gary Bernard Moore, a state prisoner at Kern Valley State Prison, filed this *pro se* action for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. His petition is now before the Court for review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243 and Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Petitioner has paid the filing fee.

BACKGROUND

According to the petition, petitioner, in 2006, was found guilty of burglary, and was sentenced to twenty-nine years in state prison. Petitioner sought, and was denied, relief on direct and collateral state review. This federal petition followed.

No. C 09-1634 RS (PR)
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

DISCUSSION

This Court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus “in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). A district court considering an application for a writ of habeas corpus shall “award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto.” 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the petition are vague or conclusory, palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. *See Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990).

As grounds for federal habeas relief, petitioner alleges that (1) the trial court violated his right to due process when imposed a sentence based on convictions that did not qualify as sentencing enhancements;¹ (2) he was denied his Confrontation Clause rights when he was denied the opportunity to testify and examine witnesses and evidence at his sentencing hearing; and (3) his sentence violates the terms of a prior plea agreement. Liberally construed, these claims appear to be cognizable in a federal habeas action.

CONCLUSION

18 1. The Clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order, the petition and all
19 attachments thereto, on respondent and respondent’s counsel, the Attorney General for the
20 State of California. The Clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on petitioner.

21 2. Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner, within **ninety (90)**
22 days of the date this order is filed, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the
23 Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not
24 be granted based on petitioner’s cognizable claims. Respondent shall file with the answer
25 and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that previously have
26

27 ¹ This claim is a consolidation of claims 1–3 and 5 stated in the petition.
28

1 been transcribed and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by
2 the petition.

3 3. If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse
4 with the Court and serving it on respondent's counsel within **thirty (30)** days of the date the
5 answer is filed.

6 4. In lieu of an answer, respondent may file, within **ninety (90)** days of the date this
7 order is filed, a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds, as set forth in the Advisory
8 Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files
9 such a motion, petitioner shall file with the Court and serve on respondent an opposition or
10 statement of non-opposition within **thirty (30)** days of the date the motion is filed, and
11 respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15)** days of
12 the date any opposition is filed.

13 5. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the Court must be served on
14 respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel.

15 6. It is Petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep the
16 Court and respondent informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's
17 orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for
18 failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

19 7. Upon a showing of good cause, requests for a reasonable extension of time will be
20 granted provided they are filed on or before the deadline they seek to extend.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 DATED: April 7, 2010


RICHARD SEEBORG
United States District Judge

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT A HARD COPY OF THIS ORDER WAS MAILED TO:**

2 Gary B. Moore
3 F-17016
4 Kern Valley State Prison
5 P. O. 5104
6 Delano, Ca 93216

7
8
9
10
11 DATED: 04/7/2010

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
s/ Chambers Staff
Chambers of Judge Richard Seeborg

* Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to any co-counsel who have not registered with the Court's electronic filing system.