Armijo v. Cozzi-Rhodes

Doc. 5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 12-cv-00244-BNB

ARTURO D. ARMIJO,

Applicant,

٧.

T. K. COZZI-RHODES, Warden,

Respondent.

ORDER TO FILE PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Applicant, Arturo D. Armijo, is a prisoner in the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons, who currently is incarcerated at the Federal Correctional Institution in Florence, Colorado. Mr. Armijo initiated this action by filing an Application for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The Court entered an order on February 8, 2012, instructing Mr. Armijo either to pay the filing fee or submit a request to proceed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. He paid the \$5.00 filing fee on March 12, 2012.

As part of the preliminary consideration of the Application in this case and pursuant to *Keck v. Hartley*, 550 F. Supp. 2d 1272 (D. Colo. 2008), the Court has determined that a limited Preliminary Response is appropriate. Respondent is directed pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts to file a Preliminary Response limited to addressing the affirmative defense of exhaustion of administrative remedies with respect to Incident Report No. 2179241. If Respondent does not intend to raise this affirmative defense, Respondent must notify the Court of that decision in the Preliminary Response. Respondent may

not file a dispositive motion as a Preliminary Response, or an Answer, or otherwise

address the merits of the claims in response to this Order.

In support of the Preliminary Response, Respondent should attach as exhibits all

relevant portions of the administrative record, including but not limited to copies of all

documents demonstrating whether Applicant has exhausted administrative remedies.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that within twenty-one days from the date of this Order

Respondent shall file a Preliminary Response that complies with this Order. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that within twenty-one days of the filing of the

Preliminary Response Applicant may file a Reply, if he desires. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that if Respondent does not intend to raise the affirmative

defense of exhaustion of administrative remedies, Respondent must notify the Court of

that decision in the Preliminary Response.

Dated: March 13, 2012

BY THE COURT:

s/Boyd N. Boland

United States Magistrate Judge

2