

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

*\*E-FILED - 2/9/10\**

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

CLOYZELLE K. JONES,	)	No. C 07-1013 RMW (PR)
	)	
Petitioner,	)	ORDER REQUIRING RESPONDENT
	)	TO LODGE ADDITIONAL
vs.	)	EXHIBITS
	)	
BEN CURRY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
_____	)	

Petitioner, a California prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Following a review of the petition, the court found petitioner’s claims cognizable and ordered respondents to show cause why the petition should not be granted. Respondents filed an answer denying the merits of the petition, along with a supporting memorandum and exhibits.

Respondents filed numerous exhibits, but failed to include the decision of the Supreme Court of California denying the petition for habeas corpus. In their answer, respondents state that the Supreme Court denied the petition in a “reasoned decision” and cites to Exhibit 6, attached to their answer. (Resp. Ans., p. 2.) However, Exhibit 6 merely includes computer print outs of the California Appellate Court case information.

Accordingly, **within seven (7) days** of the date this order is filed, respondent shall lodge (or file and serve on petitioner) the actual opinion or order of the Supreme Court of California

1 denying petitioner's state habeas petition on September 13, 2006. If respondents choose to lodge  
2 this supplemental exhibit, as opposed to filing and serving it on petitioner, they shall file and  
3 serve on petitioner a notice of lodging supplemental exhibits.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: 2/8/10

  
RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28