Wilson v. Hedgpeth

27

28

| 1 | 1 | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2 | | |
| 3 | 3 | | |
| 4 | 4 | | |
| 5 | 5 | | |
| 6 | 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DIS | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 7 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRIC | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | KINIKO KINIO WILSON, | | |
| 11 | Pentioner, | No. C 11-05207 WHA | |
| 12 | ٧. | | |
| 13 | ANTHONY HEDGPETH, | ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING | |
| 1415 | Respondent. | | |
| 16 | 16 | | |
| 17 | When petitioner Kimiko Wilson filed his habeas petition, he was not represented by | | |
| 18 | counsel. Thus, respondent has not had the opportunity to respond to any of the new arguments | | |
| | that petitioner's counsel raises in the traverse. Respondent may have until FEBRUARY 27, 2014 | | |
| 19 | AT NOON, to file a responsive brief, no longer than 10 pages, that addresses those new | | |
| 20 | arguments. | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | II IS SO ORDERED. | | |
| 23 | 23 | | |
| 24 | Dated. Teordary 0, 2014. \overline{W}_{II} | HALSHD HAME | |
| 25 | UNI UNI | TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | |
| 26 | 26 | | |