

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

\*E-Filed 3/21/14\*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

DONALD R. LAFLAMME,  
Petitioner,

No. C 13-2934 RS (PR)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

v.

BLANCHARD, Warden,  
Respondents.

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

The original petition was dismissed with leave to amend because it was prolix and incomprehensible. The amended petition also contains incomprehensible claims, and therefore fails to correct the serious deficiencies of the first. Because the claims are incomprehensible, the petition fails to meet the specificity and clarity requirements of *Mayle v. Felix*, 545 U.S. 644, 655 (2005). Accordingly, this habeas action is DISMISSED without prejudice. Because this dismissal is without prejudice, petitioner may file a motion to reopen the action, but any such motion must contain a petition putting forth comprehensible claims. Petitioner's motion to consolidate his actions (Docket No. 11) is DENIED as moot. The Clerk shall terminate Docket No. 11, enter judgment in favor of respondents, and close the file.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: March 21, 2014

  
RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge

No. C 13-2934 RS (PR)  
ORDER OF DISMISSAL