

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEFFERSON D. WALKER,)	No. C 09-2791 JSW (PR)
Petitioner,)	
vs.)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
B. CURRY, Warden,)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of California, currently incarcerated at the Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, California, has filed a habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 alleging constitutional violations in his parole denial by the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH). Petitioner has paid the filing fee. This order directs Respondent to show cause why the petition should not be granted.

BACKGROUND

According to the petition, Petitioner was convicted of first degree murder in Alameda County Superior Court in 1982 and was sentenced to 25 years-to-life in state prison. In this habeas action, Petitioner does not challenge his conviction, but instead challenges the execution of his sentence. Petitioner contends that the 2007 BPH decision to deny him parole violates his federal due process rights. He alleges that he has exhausted state judicial remedies as to all of the claims raised in his federal petition.

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 I Standard of Review

3 This court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus “in behalf of a
4 person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is
5 in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28
6 U.S.C. § 2254(a).

7 It shall “award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause
8 why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the
9 applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto.” *Id.* § 2243.

10 II Legal Claims

11 Petitioner alleges that his constitutional rights were violated by the 2007 decision
12 to deny him parole. *See Board of Pardons v. Allen*, 482 U.S. 369 (1987); *see, e.g.,*
13 *Superintendent v. Hill*, 472 U.S. 445 (1985); *McQuillion v. Duncan*, 342 F.3d 1012,
14 1015 (9th Cir. 2003); *Biggs v. Terhune*, 334 F.3d 910, 915-17 (9th Cir. 2003). Liberally
15 construed, the allegations are sufficient to warrant a response from Respondent.

16 **CONCLUSION**

17 *For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,*

18 1. The Clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition, and
19 all attachments thereto, on Respondent and Respondent's attorney, the Attorney General
20 of the State of California. The Clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on Petitioner.

21 2. Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on Petitioner, within **sixty (60)**
22 days of the issuance of this order, 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
24 not be granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on Petitioner a copy of all
25 portions of the state record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a
26 determination of the issues presented by the petition. If Petitioner wishes to respond to
27 the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the Court and serving it on Respondent
28


1 within **thirty (30)** days of his receipt of the answer.

2 3. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an
3 answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing
4 Section 2254 Cases. If Respondent files such a motion, Petitioner shall file with the Court
5 and serve on Respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within **thirty (30)**
6 days of receipt of the motion, and Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on
7 Petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15)** days of receipt of any opposition.

8 4. It is Petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep
9 the Court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper captioned "Notice
10 of Change of Address." He must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion.
11 Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant
12 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b)

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: October 26, 2009

15 
16 _____
17 JEFFREY S. WHITE
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4

5 JEFFERSON D WALKER,
6 Plaintiff,
7

Case Number: CV09-02791 JSW

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

8 v.

9 BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS et al,
10 Defendant.
_____ /

11 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
12 Court, Northern District of California.

13 That on October 26, 2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing
14 said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by
15 depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office
16 delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

17 Jefferson D. Walker
18 California Training Facility
19 P.O. Box 689
C-49778
Soledad, CA 93960

20 Dated: October 26, 2009



21 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk
22
23
24
25
26
27
28