Adams v. D	avis			
	1			
	2			
	3			
	4			
	5			
6 7 8 9 10 <b>1</b> 1	KASEEM ADAMS,			
	7	Petiti	Petitioner,	No. C 15-4358 EDL (PR) ORDER REOPENING CASE; ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
	8	٧.		
	9	RON DAVIS, Warden,		
	10	Respondent.		
	11	On September 23, 2015, petitioner, a state prisoner, filed a <i>pro se</i> petition f		
ct Court lifornia	12			

On September 23, 2015, petitioner, a state prisoner, filed a *pro se* petition for a writ
of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.<sup>1</sup> On November 4, 2015, the Court
dismissed the petition for failure to pay the filing fee. (Docket No. 3.) That same day,
petitioner paid the filing fee. (Docket No. 5.) Accordingly, the Court directs the Clerk of the
Court to reopen this case. For the reasons stated below, respondent is ordered to show
cause why the petition should not be granted.

## DISCUSSION

# 19 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).

A district court shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." 28 U.S.C. § 2243.

27

28

18

Doc. 8

Dockets.Justia.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Petitioner consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction. (Docket No. 1 at 7.)

## B. Background

1

6

According to the petition, petitioner was convicted in 1999 pursuant to a plea of nolo
contendere to voluntary manslaughter. The trial court sentenced petition to the "upper
term" of 11 years. Petitioner filed unsuccessful state habeas petitions in each level of the
California courts. The underlying federal petition was filed on September 23, 2015.

#### C. Legal Claims

As grounds for federal habeas relief, petitioner alleges that his sentence violates his
Sixth Amendment right to a trial by jury, and specifically, *Cunningham v. California*, 549
U.S. 270, 273 (2007). Liberally construed, the Court orders respondent to show cause why
the petition should not be granted.

#### CONCLUSION

11

12

28

1. The Clerk shall re-open this case.

The Clerk shall serve by mail a copy of this order, the petition and all
 attachments thereto, and a magistrate judge consent form upon 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.

Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner, within sixty days
 of the date this order is filed, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules
 Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be
 granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all
 portions of the underlying state criminal record that have been transcribed previously and
 that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition. At that time,
 respondent shall also file his magistrate judge consent form.

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

4. Respondent may file 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

United States District Court For the Northern District of California Section 2254 Cases within sixty days of the date this order is filed. If respondent files such
 a motion, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or
 statement of non-opposition within twenty-eight days of the date the motion is filed, and
 respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner a reply within fourteen days of
 the date any opposition is filed.

5. It is petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. 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 and all parties
informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper captioned "Notice of Change
of Address." He 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).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January <u>6</u>, 2016.

17 P:\PRO-SE\EDL\HC.15\Adams358reopen.wpd

Land United States Magistrate Judge