

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 8/25/10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JOHNNY PLACENCIA,
Petitioner,

No. C 10-1323 RS (PR)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

v.

RANDY GROUNDS, Warden,
Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

This is a federal habeas corpus action filed by a *pro se* state prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The amended 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.

BACKGROUND

According to the petition, in 2007, the Board of Parole Hearings (“Board”) found petitioner unsuitable for parole. In response petitioner sought, but was later denied, relief on state collateral review. This federal habeas petition followed.

No. C 10-1323 RS (PR)
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

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

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 the Board violated his right to due process when it used unreliable confidential information in petitioner’s file to determine his parole suitability. Liberally construed, this claim appears to be cognizable in a federal habeas action.

CONCLUSION

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

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

26 3. If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse
27 with the Court and serving it on respondent’s counsel within **thirty (30)** days of the date the
28

1 answer is filed.

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

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

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

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

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 DATED: August 25, 2010

19 
20 RICHARD SEEBORG
21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28