

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
OAKLAND DIVISION

DANIEL RAYFEL WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

vs.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
Governor; and JERRY BROWN,
Attorney General of California,

Respondents.

No. C 10-5005 PJH (PR)

**ORDER FOR PETITIONER TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY PETITION
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
FOR FAILURE TO EXHAUST**

This is a habeas case brought pro se by a state prisoner. It is directed to his conviction in San Francisco Superior Court for stalking, second degree burglary, and making criminal threats. He says that presently he is on parole. He has paid the filing fee.

An application for a federal writ of habeas corpus filed by a prisoner who is in state custody pursuant to a judgment of a state court may not be granted unless the prisoner has first exhausted state judicial remedies, either by way of a direct appeal or in collateral proceedings, by presenting the highest state court available with a fair opportunity to rule on the merits of each and every issue he or she seeks to raise in federal court. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b),(c); *Granberry v. Greer*, 481 U.S. 129, 133-34 (1987). Petitioner has the burden of pleading exhaustion in his habeas petition. See *Cartwright v. Cupp*, 650 F.2d 1103, 1104 (9th Cir. 1981).

Petitioner says that he appealed the conviction to the California Court of Appeal. That court affirmed. *People v. Williams*, 2010 WL 3412898 at *1 (Cal. Ct. App. Aug. 31, 2010) (unpublished). The form petition asks whether the petitioner has appealed to the Supreme Court of California or “[a]ny other court;” as to each he has written “N/A.” He also

1 has written "N/A" in response to the question on the form whether he has sought relief "in
2 any proceeding other than an appeal." That is, he says that he did not petition the
3 California Supreme Court for review and has not filed any state habeas petitions.¹ The
4 California appellate courts' website confirms this, showing only the case in the court of
5 appeal. It thus appears that he has not exhausted.

6 Within thirty days of the date this order is entered, petitioner shall show cause why
7 this petition should not be dismissed for failure to exhaust. If he does not, the case will be
8 dismissed.²

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: December 20, 2010.



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16 P:\PRO-SE\PJH\HC.10\WILLIAMS,D5005.OSC-P.wpd

17
18 _____
19 ¹ In California, the supreme court, intermediate courts of appeal, and superior courts
20 all have original habeas corpus jurisdiction. See *Nino v. Galaza*, 183 F.3d 1003, 1006 n.2 (9th
21 Cir. 1999). Although a superior court order denying habeas corpus relief is not appealable, a
22 state prisoner may file a new habeas corpus petition in the court of appeals. See *id.* If the
23 court of appeals denies relief, the petitioner may seek review in the California Supreme Court
24 by way of a petition for review, or may instead file an original habeas petition in the supreme
25 court. See *id.* at n.3.

26 ² Petitioner is cautioned that under the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act,
27 petitions filed by prisoners challenging non-capital state convictions or sentences must be filed
28 within one year of the latest of the date on which: (1) the judgment became final after the
conclusion of direct review or expiration of the time for seeking direct review; (2) an
impediment to filing an application created by unconstitutional state action was removed, if
such action prevented petitioner from filing; (3) the constitutional right asserted was recognized
by the United States Supreme Court, if the right was newly recognized and made retroactive
to cases on collateral review; or (4) the factual predicate of the claim could have been
discovered through the exercise of due diligence. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). Time during which
a properly filed application for collateral review (such as a state habeas petition) is pending is
excluded from the one-year time limit. *Id.* § 2244(d)(2). The time that a federal petition, such
as this one, is pending is not excluded. See *Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 180-81 (2001).