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

EDGAR ENRIQUE VELASQUEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROSEMARY NDOH,

Defendant.

Case No. <u>16-cv-02666-DMR</u>

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Petitioner Edgar Enrique Velasquez, a state prisoner, has filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This action has been assigned to the undersigned Magistrate Judge.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), with written consent of all parties, a magistrate judge may conduct all proceedings in a case, including entry of judgment. Appeal will be directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(3).

On June 13, 2016, Petitioner consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction in this matter. [Docket No. 3.]

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

It does not appear from the face of the petition that it is without merit. Good cause appearing, the court hereby issues the following orders:

- The Clerk of the Court shall serve a Magistrate Judge jurisdiction consent form, a copy of this Order, as well as the petition and all attachments thereto upon Respondent and Respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California.
- 2. Within **twenty-eight** (28) **days** of the issuance of this Order, Respondent shall complete and file the Magistrate Judge jurisdiction consent form to indicate whether he/she consents or declines to proceed before the assigned Magistrate Judge. Respondent is free to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

withhold consent without adverse consequences. If Respondent consents to a Magistrate Judge's jurisdiction, this case will be handled by the undersigned Magistrate Judge. If Respondent declines, the case will be reassigned to a District Judge. Whether Respondent consents or declines to proceed before the assigned Magistrate Judge, the parties shall abide by the briefing schedule below.

- 3. Respondent shall file with this court and serve upon Petitioner, within sixty (60) days of the issuance of this Order, an Answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be issued. Respondent shall file with the Answer a copy of all portions of the relevant state records that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.
- 4. If Petitioner wishes to respond to the Answer, he shall do so by filing a Traverse with the court and serving it on Respondent within twenty-eight (28) days of his receipt of the Answer. Should Petitioner fail to do so, the petition will be deemed submitted and ready for decision twenty-eight (28) days after the date Petitioner is served with Respondent's Answer.
- 5. Respondent may file with this court and serve upon Petitioner, within sixty (60) days of the issuance of this Order, a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an Answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If Respondent files a motion to dismiss, Petitioner shall file with the court and serve on Respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition to the motion within twenty-eight (28) days of receipt of the motion, and Respondent shall file with the court and serve on Petitioner a reply within **fourteen** (14) days of receipt of any opposition.
- 6. It is Petitioner's responsibility to prosecute this case. Petitioner must keep the court and Respondent informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a timely fashion. Petitioner must also serve on Respondent's counsel all communications with the court by mailing a true copy of the document to Respondent's counsel.
- 7. Extensions of time are not favored, though reasonable extensions will be granted. Any motion for an extension of time must be filed no later than **fourteen (14) days** prior to the

United States District Court Northern District of California

deadline sought to be extended.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 27, 2016

