

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3 DALE THOMAS ANDERSON,

No. C 10-02020 SBA (PR)

4 Petitioner,

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
DISMISS; STAYING HABEAS
PROCEEDINGS; DIRECTING
PETITIONER TO FILE QUARTERLY
STATUS REPORTS; AND DIRECTING
CLERK TO CLOSE THIS CASE
ADMINISTRATIVELY UNTIL THE
COURT ISSUES ORDER LIFTING STAY**

5 v.

6 EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,

7 Respondents.
8 _____/

9
10 Petitioner, a state prisoner, has filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28
11 U.S.C. § 2254 raising eight claims. In an Order dated June 21, 2010, the Court ordered Respondent
12 to show cause why the petition should not be granted.

13 Before the Court are (1) Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition for failure to exhaust
14 state court remedies (docket no. 4) and (2) Petitioner's motion to stay his federal petition while he
15 exhausts his remedies in state court (docket no. 5).

16 **DISCUSSION**

17 Petitioner has filed a mixed petition containing exhausted and unexhausted claims. He
18 concedes that he has failed to exhaust three of his claims. Therefore, Respondent argues that the
19 action must be dismissed as a mixed petition under Rose v. Lundy, 455 U.S. 509, 510 (1982).

20 In his motion for a stay, Petitioner seeks leave to return to state court to exhaust his
21 unexhausted claims.

22 Prisoners in state custody who wish to challenge in federal habeas proceedings either the fact
23 or length of their confinement are first required to exhaust state judicial remedies by presenting the
24 highest state court available with a fair opportunity to rule on the merits of each and every claim
25 they seek to raise in federal court. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b),(c); Rose, 455 U.S. at 515-16. If
26 available state remedies have not been exhausted as to all claims, the district court must dismiss the
27 petition. Id. at 510; Guizar v. Estelle, 843 F.2d 371, 372 (9th Cir. 1988). A dismissal solely for
28

1 failure to exhaust is not a bar to returning to federal court after exhausting available state remedies.
2 See Trimble v. City of Santa Rosa, 49 F.3d 583, 586 (9th Cir. 1995).

3 Petitioners may seek a stay of the petition pursuant to Pace v. DiGuglielmo, 125 S. Ct. 1807,
4 1813-14 (2005), under which a prisoner may file a protective petition in federal court and ask the
5 court to stay federal habeas proceedings until all state remedies are exhausted. District courts have
6 the authority to issue stays, and the habeas statute does not deprive them of that authority. Rhines v.
7 Webber, 125 S. Ct. 1528, 1535 (2005). A stay is appropriate where the district court determines that
8 good cause existed for the petitioner's failure to exhaust his claims in state court, and that such
9 claims are potentially meritorious. Id.; see also Pace, 125 S. Ct. at 1813-14.

10 Here, it appears that good cause exists for Petitioner's failure to exhaust his claims on direct
11 appeal because his claims could be raised by way of state habeas corpus. Moreover, these claims
12 state cognizable bases for federal habeas relief. This is Petitioner's first habeas petition, and there is
13 no evidence that he seeks the stay for improper purposes. See Fetterly v. Paskett, 997 F.2d 1295,
14 1301-02 (9th Cir. 1993) (holding that a stay for the purpose of permitting exhaustion of unexhausted
15 claims should be granted only if the claims petitioner seeks to pursue are cognizable under § 2254;
16 there is a likelihood of prejudice to petitioner if the stay is not granted; and there is no evidence that
17 the motion for a stay is brought to delay, vex, or harass, or that the request is an abuse of the writ).
18 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Petitioner's request for a stay.

19 CONCLUSION

20 1. Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition for failure to exhaust state court remedies
21 (docket no. 4) is DENIED without prejudice to refile if Petitioner fails diligently to pursue
22 exhaustion in state court of his unexhausted claims.

23 2. Petitioner's request for a stay (docket no. 5) is GRANTED. These proceedings are
24 hereby STAYED pending Petitioner's exhaustion of his state judicial remedies. Petitioner must act
25 diligently in exhausting his state judicial remedies, or the stay may be lifted. He must file quarterly
26 reports describing the progress of his state court proceedings, commencing **thirty (30) days** from the
27 date of this Order and continuing every **ninety (90) days** thereafter until his state court proceedings
28

1 are terminated. He must also attach to his status reports copies of the cover page of any document
2 that he files with or receives from the California Supreme Court relating to the claims.

3 3. The Clerk of the Court shall ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSE the file pending the
4 stay of this action. Nothing further will take place in this action until Petitioner receives a final
5 decision from the California Supreme Court and, within **thirty (30) days** of doing so, moves to
6 reopen the action, lift the Court's stay and amend the stayed petition to add the newly-exhausted
7 claims.

8 4. This Order terminates Docket nos. 4 and 5.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: 12/9/10


SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4 DALE THOMAS ANDERSON,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 EDMUND G. BROWN JR., ET AL. et al,

8 Defendant.

Case Number: CV10-02020 SBA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

9 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
10 Court, Northern District of California.

11 That on December 10, 2010, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
12 copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said
13 envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle
14 located in the Clerk's office.

15 Dale T. Anderson
16 2159 Cardiff Circle
17 El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

18 Dated: December 10, 2010

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk