

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JAIRO BRAVO PEDROZA,)
11 Petitioner,) No. C 11-0318 CRB (PR)
12 vs.) ORDER OF DISMISSAL
13 M. LEA, Warden, et al.,) (Docket # 2)
14 Respondent(s).)
15 _____)
16

17 Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254
18 challenging a conviction and sentence from Santa Clara County Superior Court.
19 He also moves to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (docket # 2)
20 which, good cause shown, is granted.

21 Prisoners in state custody who wish to challenge collaterally in federal
22 habeas corpus proceedings either the fact or length of their confinement are first
23 required to exhaust state judicial remedies, either on direct appeal or through
24 collateral proceedings, by presenting the highest state court available with a fair
25 opportunity to rule on the merits of each and every claim they seek to raise in
26 federal court. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)-(c). Petitioner has not done so. He has
27 not presented the Supreme Court of California with an opportunity to consider
28 and rule on his claims. See O'Sullivan v. Boerckel, 526 U.S. 838, 845 (1999)

1 (state's highest court must be given opportunity to rule on claims even if review
2 is discretionary). The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED without
3 prejudice to refiling after state judicial remedies are exhausted.

4 The clerk shall enter judgment in accordance with this order and close the
5 file.

6 SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: Jan. 28, 2011

8 
9 CHARLES R. BREYER
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26