

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

DARREN FORD,  
Petitioner,

No. C 16-03051 RS (PR)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

v.

DANIEL PARAMO, Warden,  
Respondent.

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Petitioner seeks federal habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 from his state convictions. The petition for such relief is now before the Court for review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243 and Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Respondent shall file a response to the petition on or before October 17, 2016, unless an extension is granted.

**BACKGROUND**

According to the petition, in 2013, a Santa Clara County Superior Court jury convicted petitioner of annoying or molesting a child under the age of eighteen. He was sentenced to two terms of 25 years to life in state prison.

**DISCUSSION**

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

No. C 16-03051 RS (PR)  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

1 violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a).  
2 A district court considering an application for a writ of habeas corpus shall “award the writ  
3 or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted,  
4 unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled  
5 thereto.” 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in  
6 the petition are vague or conclusory, palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. *See*  
7 *Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990).

8 As grounds for federal habeas relief, petitioner alleges (1) counsel rendered  
9 ineffective assistance; and (2) the trial judge failed to order a psychiatric evaluation of  
10 petitioner or conduct a fair trial. When liberally construed, these claims are cognizable on  
11 federal habeas review.

## 12 CONCLUSION

13 1. The Clerk shall serve a copy of this order, the petition and all attachments thereto,  
14 on respondent and respondent’s counsel, the Attorney General for the State of California.  
15 The Clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on petitioner.

16 2. Respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner, within **sixty (60)** days  
17 of the date this order is filed, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules  
18 Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be  
19 granted based on petitioner’s cognizable claims. Respondent shall file with the answer and  
20 serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that previously have been  
21 transcribed and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

22 3. If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse  
23 with the Court and serving it on respondent’s counsel within **thirty (30)** days of the date the  
24 answer is filed.

25 4. In lieu of an answer, respondent may file, within **sixty (60)** days of the date this  
26 order is filed, a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds, as set forth in the Advisory  
27 Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files  
28

1 such a motion, petitioner shall file with the Court and serve on respondent an opposition or  
2 statement of non-opposition within **thirty (30)** days of the date the motion is filed, and  
3 respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15)** days of  
4 the date any opposition is filed.

5 5. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the Court must be served on  
6 respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel.

7 6. It is petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep the  
8 Court and respondent informed of any change of address and must comply with the Court's  
9 orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for  
10 failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

11 7. Upon a showing of good cause, requests for a reasonable extension of time will be  
12 granted provided they are filed on or before the deadline they seek to extend.

13 8. Petitioner's motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Docket Nos. 7 and 8) and his  
14 motion for an extension of time to file an IFP application (Docket No. 6) are DENIED as  
15 moot. His prior IFP application was granted. (Docket No. 3.)

16 9. The Clerk shall terminate Docket Nos. 6, 7 and 8.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 DATED: August 4, 2016



19 RICHARD SEEBORG  
20 United States District Judge

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28