

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  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HENRY PAUL INOCENCIO,

Petitioner,

v.

ANTHONY HEDGPATH, Warden,

Respondent.

No. C 10-2334 PJH

**ORDER VACATING BRIEFING  
SCHEDULE**

The court VACATES the supplemental briefing schedule set forth in its April 5, 2012 order. Respondent correctly points out in his April 9, 2012 letter to the court that petitioner did file a reply (traverse) in which he responded to respondent's request in his answer to dismiss the petition as untimely. Accordingly, further briefing on the timeliness issue is not warranted.

In concluding that a traverse had not been filed, the court mistakenly relied on the docket entry alone which described the traverse as "Response re Response to Order to Show Cause." A courtesy copy of the traverse, would have eliminated any confusion on the court's part. The parties are requested to be careful in the future as to the labels used to docket documents in the ECF system and are reminded that Civil L.R. 5-1 and General Order 45 require that courtesy copies be provided of all documents filed either manually or electronically. Given the heavy volume of filings in this district, the court depends on compliance with the local rules.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 10, 2012



---

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge