

1 court judgment of conviction, and must make clear which judgment of conviction
2 that is. (If Denson wishes to challenge a second state-court judgment of
3 conviction, he must initiate a second federal habeas corpus action to do so.)
4 Denson must number, consecutively, the claims in his amended petition, such that
5 each numbered claim sets forth one discrete, understandable, ground for relief, and
6 states the facts supporting that ground for relief.

7 If Denson fails to comply with any directive in this order, this action will
8 be dismissed without prejudice.

9 ECF No. 24.

10 Denson filed an amended habeas petition on May 25, 2017. ECF No. 29. On September
11 28, 2017, the respondents filed their motion to dismiss (ECF No. 37), pointing out that Denson's
12 amended petition, like his original petition, challenged two different convictions and still did not
13 make clear which claims relate to which conviction. In addition, the respondents contended that
14 certain of Denson's claims in the amended petition are unexhausted in state court. Denson did
15 not file an opposition to the motion to dismiss.

16 On February 16, 2018, Denson filed a motion to stay proceedings (ECF No. 43), in which
17 he appeared to request a stay of this action while he exhausts claims in state court. The
18 respondents filed an opposition to the motion for stay on February 28, 2018 (ECF No. 44), and
19 Denson filed a reply on March 7, 2018 (ECF No. 45). On March 13, 2018, Denson filed a second
20 amended petition for writ of habeas corpus. ECF No. 46.

21 I construe Denson's filing of the second amended petition as a motion for leave to amend.
22 A petition for writ of habeas corpus "may be amended or supplemented as provided in the rules of
23 procedure applicable to civil actions." 28 U.S.C. § 2242; *see also* Rule 12 of the Rules Governing
24 Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts (recognizing general applicability of rules
25 of civil procedure in habeas cases). Denson's motion for leave to amend is governed by Federal
26 Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2), which permits an amended pleading "only with the opposing
27 party's written consent or the court's leave." The court "should freely give leave when justice so
28 requires." *See, e.g., Outdoor Systems, Inc. v. City of Mesa*, 997 F.2d 604, 614 (9th Cir. 1993)
(denial of leave to amend reviewed "for abuse of discretion and in light of the strong public
policy permitting amendment."). Factors to be considered include "bad faith, undue delay,
prejudice to the opposing party, futility of the amendment, and whether the party has previously

1 amended his pleadings.” *Bonin v. Calderon*, 59 F.3d 815, 845 (9th Cir.1995). It appears that
2 Denson has attempted to cure the shortcomings of his original and first amended petitions
3 (however, I do not make any finding here with respect to whether he has been successful in doing
4 so). It does not appear that Denson has acted in bad faith or with undue delay, and there is no
5 appearance of prejudice to the respondents. It does not appear that Denson’s further amendment
6 would necessarily be futile. I therefore will allow the filing of the second amended petition.

7 This renders moot both the respondents’ motion to dismiss and Denson’s motion for stay,
8 and both motions will be denied on that ground. I will set a schedule for the respondents to
9 respond to the second amended petition.

10 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d),
11 the Clerk of the Court shall substitute Jerry Howell for Dwight Neven, on the docket for this case
12 as the respondent warden, and shall update the caption of the action to reflect this change.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner is granted leave of court for the filing of his
14 second amended petition for writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 46). As the second amended
15 petition has already been filed, the Clerk of the Court need take no further action in that regard.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents’ Motion to Dismiss (**ECF No. 37**) is
17 **DENIED.**

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner’s Motion to Stay Proceedings (**ECF No. 43**)
19 **is DENIED.**

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the respondents shall, within 90 days from the date of
21 this order, file an answer or other response to the second amended petition (ECF No. 46).

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the respondents file an answer, Denson shall have 60
23 days to file a reply. If the respondents file a motion to dismiss, Denson shall have 60 days to file
24 a response to the motion to dismiss, and the respondents shall thereafter have 30 days to file a
25 reply in support of the motion.

26 DATED this 18th day of April, 2018.

27 
28 _____
ANDREW P. GORDON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE