1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8		
9	ELIZABETH K. CARLEY, a.k.a. MELISSA ARIAS	
10		Case No. 2:14-cv-02097-JCM-PAL
11	Petitioner,	<u>ORDER</u>
12	vs. JO GENTRY, et al.,	
13	Respondents.	
14		
15		
16	The court granted respondents' motion to dismiss (ECF No. 10), finding that all but one	
17	ground of the petition for a writ of habeas corpus was unexhausted. The court also denied	
18	petitioner's request to stay the action while she returned to state court, because petitioner herself	
19	caused the failure to exhaust. ECF No. 24. The court instructed petitioner to file a sworn	
20	declaration in which she either dismissed the unexhausted grounds or dismissed the action while	
21	returned to state court. <u>Id.</u>	
22	Petitioner has done neither. She has filed a motion to proceed (ECF No. 25), in which sh	

Petitioner has done neither. She has filed a motion to proceed (ECF No. 25), in which she attempts to litigate again the issues that the court already has decided. The court has warned petitioner that it would dismiss the action if she did not make the required choice, and the court will do so now. The court will dismiss the action without prejudice, but petitioner should not think that such a dismissal will excuse a later application of time bars.

27 Reasonable jurists would not find the court's conclusion to be debatable or wrong, and the28 court will not issue a certificate of appealability.

she

1	Petitioner also has filed two motions or notices of appeal (ECF No. 29, 30). As with an	
2	earlier notice of appeal (ECF No. 19), petitioner is trying to appeal to this court from the denial of	
3	the state post-conviction habeas corpus petition. This court lacks jurisdiction to consider an appeal	
4	from a judgment of a state court. District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462,	
5	476, 483 n.16 (1983); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co., 263 U.S. 413, 415-16 (1923). Petitioner's sole	
6	federal remedy from a judgment of conviction of a state court is through a petition for a writ of	
7	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973).	
8	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion to proceed (ECF No. 25) is	
9	DENIED.	
10	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the court will take no further action upon petitioner's	
11	notices of appeal (ECF Nos. 29, 30).	
12	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice. The clerk	
13	of the court shall enter judgment accordingly and close this action.	
14	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is DENIED .	
15	DATED: March 20, 2017.	
16		
17	JAMES C. Mahan	
18	United States District Judge	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	-2-	