

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

RICHARD WADE FARLEY,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
RON DAVIS, Warden, San Quentin  
State Prison,  
Respondent.

Case No. 16-cv-4443-PJH  
DEATH PENALTY CASE  
**ORDER DENYING *PRO SE* MOTION**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Court is in receipt of Farley’s pro se letter filed April 27, 2017, wherein he seeks an Order granting access to an electronic version of his trial transcripts and a computer system in his cell on which to view the transcripts. See ECF Doc. 21.

Farley is represented by counsel and represented parties do not have the right to proceed *pro se*. See *United States v. Olano*, 62 F.3d 1180, 1193 (9th Cir. 1995). The “right to counsel and the right to proceed pro se are disjunctive rights.” *United States v. Crowhurst*, 629 F.2d 1297, 1301 (9th Cir. 1980). Here, Farley has two attorneys acting on his behalf who are able to file any motion that, in their professional judgment, they deem to have merit. Thus, any motion Farley wishes to present to the Court must be filed through his counsel of record. Accordingly, this motion is DENIED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 10, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge