Farnum v. LeGrand

Doc. 24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Case No. 2:13-cv-01304-APG-PAL

JOHN MICHAEL FARNUM

10 Petitioner,

VS.

ROBERT LEGRAND, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

Respondents filed a motion to disqualify counsel for petitioner (Dkt. #10), petitioner filed an opposition (Dkt. #12), and respondents replied (Dkt. #13). The court directed respondents to identify claims that they argue are procedurally defaulted, and the court directed petitioner to rebut that argument and to file a waiver of any present or potential conflict of interest. Order (Dkt. #14). Respondents have filed their response to the order (Dkt. #15), and petitioner has filed an opposition (Dkt. #23) with a waiver personally executed by petitioner.

Respondents' response and petitioner's waiver have ended any concern of a conflict of interest for petitioner's counsel. Respondents have noted that none of petitioner's current claims of ineffective assistance of counsel appear to be procedurally defaulted, and thus petitioner's counsel would not be in the position of arguing his own ineffectiveness as cause to excuse the procedural default. Petitioner has waived any future claim that counsel was ineffective for not raising in his state habeas corpus petition any claims that trial or direct-appeal counsel were ineffective. Petitioner also has stated that he has consulted with an independent attorney on the matter. Under these circumstances, there is no reason to remove petitioner's current counsel.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that respondents motion to disqualify counsel for petitioner (Dkt. #10) is **DENIED**. Briefing on the petition shall continue in accordance with the court's prior orders (Dkt. #s 8 and 14).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, from this date forward, the hard copy of any exhibits shall be forwarded—for this case—to the staff attorneys in Las Vegas.

Dated: May 7, 2014.

ANDREW P. GORDON United States District Judge