

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

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

RAYMOND DEGARMO,

No. C-11-4859 TEH (PR)

Petitioner,

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE
TO EXHAUST

v.

SECRETARY OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND
REHABILITATION, et al.,

Respondents.

_____ /

On September 30, 2011, Petitioner Raymond DeGarmo, an inmate at La Palma Correction Center in Eloy, Arizona, filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging a judgment of conviction from Contra Costa County Superior Court. On April 10, 2012, the Court ordered Respondents to file an answer showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted or, in lieu of an answer, to file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds. Doc #6. The Order stated, "If Respondent files such a motion, Petitioner

1 shall file with the Court and serve on Respondent an Opposition or
2 Statement of Non-Opposition within thirty (30) days of receipt of
3 the motion." April 10, 2012 Order at 5.

4 On July 2, 2012, Respondents filed a motion to dismiss on
5 the ground that none of the claims asserted by Petitioner in his
6 petition had been exhausted. More than thirty days have passed
7 since Respondents filed their motion, and Petitioner has not filed
8 an opposition. It appears that Petitioner concedes that his claims
9 are unexhausted.

10 I

11 Prisoners in state custody who wish to challenge
12 collaterally in federal habeas proceedings either the fact or length
13 of their confinement are required first to exhaust state judicial
14 remedies, either on direct appeal or through collateral proceedings,
15 by presenting the highest state court available with a fair
16 opportunity to rule on the merits of each and every claim they seek
17 to raise in federal court. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b), (c). The
18 exhaustion-of-state-remedies doctrine "reflects a policy of
19 federal-state comity" designed to give a State "an initial
20 "opportunity to pass upon and correct" alleged violations of its
21 prisoners' federal rights.'" Picard v. Connor, 404 U.S. 270, 275
22 (1971) (citations omitted). The court generally may not grant
23 relief on an unexhausted claim, see 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1).

24 Both the legal basis and the factual basis of the claim
25 must be "fairly presented" to the state courts in order to exhaust.
26 Picard, 404 U.S. at 275; Peterson v. Lampert, 319 F.3d 1153, 1155-56
27 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). It is not sufficient to raise only the
28

1 facts supporting the claim; rather, "the constitutional claim . . .
2 inherent in those facts" must be brought to the attention of the
3 state court. Picard, 404 U.S. at 277. The state's highest court
4 must "be alerted to the fact that the prisoners are asserting claims
5 under the United States Constitution." Duncan v. Henry, 513 U.S.
6 364, 368 (1995). With regard to the factual basis for the claim,
7 "the petitioner must only provide the state court with the operative
8 facts, that is, 'all of the facts necessary to give application to
9 the constitutional principle upon which [the petitioner] relies.'" Davis v. Silva, 511 F.3d 1005, 1009 (9th Cir. 2008) (citations
10 omitted). If state remedies have not been exhausted as to all
11 claims, the district court must dismiss the petition. Rose v.
12 Lundy, 455 U.S. 509, 510 (1982); Guizar v. Estelle, 843 F.2d 371,
13 372 (9th Cir. 1988).

14
15 II

16 After Petitioner was convicted of several crimes, the
17 state trial court suspended the execution of sentence and placed
18 Petitioner on probation but, later that day, the court reconsidered
19 and imposed the previously suspended prison term. Petitioner
20 appealed his conviction to the California court of appeal, which
21 affirmed the judgment. On June 28, 2011, Petitioner filed a
22 petition for review in the California Supreme Court. Resp.'s Ex. 1.
23 In that petition, Petitioner presented the following two issues:
24 (1) A court cannot revoke probation without finding a willful
25 violation of its terms; and (2) the court's error is not subject to
26 harmless error review, and regardless cannot be harmless error. Id.
27 On August 10, 2011, the Supreme Court issued a one-sentence denial.
28 Resp.'s Ex. 2.

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

moot and close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED 08/20/2012



THELTON E. HENDERSON
United States District Judge

G:\PRO-SE\TEH\HC.11\Degarmo-11-4859-DisExhaustionGrant.wpd