

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

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

PEARL ZAMORA,
Plaintiff,
v.
U.S.A.,
Defendant.

E-FILED - 9/30/09

CASE NO.: C-06-04381-RMW
(Criminal No.: CR-05-00624-RMW)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION
ATTACKING SENTENCE
(28 U.S.C. § 2255)**

(Docket Nos.: 1, 16)

In her motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2255 Pearl Zamora complains that her attorney did not explain procedures and consequences to her clearly, was not prepared and promised she could present her defense at sentencing. The record belies Zamora's claims. She signed a written plea agreement and participated in a thorough Rule 11 colloquy. There was a sentencing hearing at which she testified. She fails to explain how she was prejudiced. The motion is denied.

Unfortunately, it appears that this motion got overlooked on the docket. Although there were two post-plea supervised release issues that came before the court, the § 2255 motion was apparently not noticed by anyone. Fortunately, no prejudice has resulted.

DATED: September 30, 2009



RONALD M. WHYTE
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

1

2

3 Copy of Order Mailed to:

4 Pearl Zamora
5 31160 Oakhill Way
6 Hayward, CA 94544

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28