1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	
9	
10	DANIEL RICHARDS, No. C 10-3007 WHA (PR)
11	Petitioner, ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
12	V.
13	A. NOLL, Warden,
14	Respondent.
15	/
16	INTRODUCTION
17	Petitioner, a California prisoner currently incarcerated at the Correctional Training
18	Facility in Soledad, California, filed a pro se petition fr a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28
19	U.S.C. 2254. He has paid the filing fee. The petition attacks the denial of parole, so venue is
20	proper in this district, which is where petitioner is confined. See 28 U.S.C. 2241(d) (venue
21	proper in both district of conviction and district of confinement).
22	STATEMENT
23	In 1988, petitioner was convicted of second-degree murder in Los Angeles County
24	Superior Court, and he was sentenced to a term of fifteen years to life in state prison. In 2009,
25	the California Board of Parole Hearings ("Board) found petitioner unsuitable for parole for a
26	seventh time. Petitioner challenged this decision unsuccessfully via habeas petitions filed in all
27	three levels of the California courts.
28	//

## ANALYSIS

## A. STANDARD OF REVIEW

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); *Rose v. Hodges*, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). Habeas corpus petitions must meet heightened pleading requirements. *McFarland v. Scott*, 512 U.S. 849, 856 (1994). An application for a federal writ of habeas corpus filed by a prisoner who is in state custody pursuant to a judgment of a state court must "specify all the grounds for relief which are available to the petitioner ... and shall set forth in summary form the facts supporting each of the grounds thus specified." Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, 28 U.S.C. foll. 2254. ""[N]otice' pleading is not sufficient, for the petition is expected to state facts that point to a 'real possibility of constitutional error." Rule 4 Advisory Committee Notes (quoting *Aubut v. Maine*, 431 F.2d 688, 689 (1st Cir. 1970).

## **B.** LEGAL CLAIMS

As grounds for federal habeas relief, petitioner claims that the denial of parole violated his right to due process because it was not based on sufficient evidence of his current dangerousness. Petitioner's claim, when liberally construed, is cognizable.

## CONCLUSION

The clerk shall mail a copy of this order and the petition with all attachments to the
 respondent and the respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The
 clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on the petitioner.

23 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within ninety days of the
24 issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing
25 Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted based on
26 the claims found cognizable herein. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on
27 petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously
28 and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within thirty days of the date the answer is filed.

3. Respondent may file, within ninety days, a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within thirty days of the date the motion is filed, and respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within fifteen days of the date any opposition is filed.

9 4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on
respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner must
keep the court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a
timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute
pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). *See Martinez v. Johnson*, 104 F.3d 769, 772
(5th Cir. 1997) (Rule 41(b) applicable in habeas cases).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

G:\PRO-SE\WHA\HC.10\RICHARDS3007.OSC.wpd

17 Dated: September <u>2</u>, 2010.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28