Madrid v. Neven et al Doc. 32

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 4 Mariano Madrid, 2:15-cv-00118-JAD-PAL 5 Petitioner **Order Dismissing Case** 6 v. 7 Dwight Neven, et al., 8 Respondents

Pro se petitioner Mariano Madrid is serving two consecutive life sentences with the possibility of parole after 20 years after his conviction for first-degree murder with a deadly-weapon enhancement.¹ He filed this mixed petition for a writ of habeas corpus with exhausted and unexhausted claims, and I directed Madrid to choose one of three options: (1) abandon the unexhausted claims and proceed on the exhausted claims only; (2) dismiss this federal action and return to state court to exhaust his unexhausted claims; or (3) file a motion to stay and abey his exhausted claims and return to state court to exhaust his unexhausted claims.²

Madrid chose the third option, but he did not make the required showing under *Rhines v*. *Weber*³ to permit me to grant him a *Rhines* stay, so I denied his motion and directed him to choose one of the other two options.⁴ Instead of choosing one of the other two options, Madrid filed a renewed motion to stay and abey his exhausted claims that still failed to satisfy *Rhines*, so

¹ NEVADA DEP'T OF CORRECTIONS, https://www.doc.nv.gov/Inmates/Home/ (last visited Nov.

21

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

22, 2017) (inmate search by name Mariano Madrid or by offender ID 1006135).

26

27 Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269 (2005).

28

⁴ ECF No. 24.

² ECF No. 20.

I denied that as well.⁵ I gave Madrid one more opportunity to either abandon his unexhausted claims and proceed on the exhausted ones or return to state court to exhaust his unexhausted claims. Madrid decided to return to state court to exhaust his unexhausted claims, 6 so I dismiss this action without prejudice to his ability to file a new, separate petition for habeas corpus after he exhausts his claims in state court—subject of course to any statutes of limitations. I also decline to issue Madrid a certificate of appealability because reasonable jurists would not find my decision to dismiss this action without prejudice to be debatable or wrong. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case is **DISMISSED without** prejudice. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**. The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS CASE. DATED: November 27, 2017. Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

⁵ ECF No. 30.

⁶ ECF No. 31.