

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

DEMETRIUS LAGENE CHAFFORD,

Petitioner,

No. C 09-1574 PJH (PR)

vs.

ORDER NUNC PRO TUNC

ANTHONY HEGPETH, Warden,


Respondent.

This is a habeas case filed pro se by a state prisoner. In an order entered on January 15, 2010 (docket number 17), the court denied petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel and granted "[p]etitioner's motion for an extension of time to file his traverse." Petitioner's motion was, however, incorrectly identified as "document number 6," which in fact was a motion for an extension of time by respondent.

The order (document 17) is **AMENDED** nunc pro tunc to show the number of petitioner's **GRANTED** motion of time to file his traverse as document eleven (document 11). His duplicate motion (document 10) is **DENIED** as moot. The traverse filed October 21, 2009, is timely. Respondent's motion for an extension of time to file an answer (document 6) is **GRANTED**. The answer is deemed timely.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 23, 2010.



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge