

Dockets.Justia.com

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

and the state appellate court affirmed the judgment on February 16, 2011. The state high court denied review on April 27, 2011. (<u>Id.</u> at 2-3.) Petitioner filed state habeas petitions, with the California Supreme Court denying review on December 14, 2011.

Petitioner filed the instant federal habeas petition on March 30, 2012.

DISCUSSION

A. <u>Standard of Review</u>

This court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a).

It shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." Id. § 2243.

B. Legal Claims

Petitioner claims that his counsel rendered ineffective assistance because he failed to present mitigating evidence. Liberally construed, his claim is cognizable under § 2254 and merits an answer from Respondent.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown,

 The Clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition and all attachments thereto on Respondent and Respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The Clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on Petitioner.

27 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within
28 sixty (60) days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to

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

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 and serve on Petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

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 **thirty (30) days** of his receipt of the answer.

3. Respondent may file 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 such a motion, Petitioner shall file with the Court and serve on Respondent an opposition or statement of nonopposition within **thirty (30) days** of receipt of the motion, and Respondent shall file with the court and serve on Petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15) days** of receipt of any opposition.

4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on Respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to Respondent's counsel. Petitioner must also keep the Court and all parties informed of any change of address.

DATED: 7/2/2012

EDWARD J. DAVILA United States District Judge

3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD SANDERSON,

Petitioner,

Case Number: CV12-01595 EJD

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

v.

BOBBY PHILLIPS, Warden,

Respondent.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on 7/5/2012, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Richard Sanderson F-43953 Tallahatchie County Correctional Facility 415 U. S. Highway 49 North Tutwiler, MS 38963

Dated: 7/5/2012

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk /s/ By: Elizabeth Garcia, Deputy Clerk