1			
2			
3			
4 5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
, 8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
9	MICHELLE TAYLOR,	ase No. 3:13-cv-00035-MMD-VPC	
10	Petitioner,	ORDER	
11	V.		
12	CAROLYN MYLES,		
13	Respondents.		
14			
15	This habeas matter comes before the Court following upon petitioner's counsel's		
16	failure to comply with the local rules and directives of this Court.		
17	On January 25, 2013, petitioner filed the petition in this matter signed and verified		
18	by counsel in California. On January 28, 2013, notices (dkt. nos. 2 & 3) were sent		
19	pursuant to, inter alia, Local Rule IA 10-2 and Local Rule LR 3-1, directing counsel to:		
20	(a) file a verified petition for leave to proceed pro hac vice; (b) file a designation of local		
21	counsel; (c) register on CM/ECF; and (d) file a properly completed civil cover sheet.		
22	The first notice (dkt. no. 2) gave counse	el until March 14, 2013, to file a verified	
23	petition for leave to proceed pro hac vice. S	ee also Local Rule IA 10-2(e)(requiring	
24	compliance with the rule in civil cases within 45 days after counsel's first appearance).		
25	There has been no response by counsel in compliance with the local rules and		
26	directives of this Court. Inter alia, a failure to comply timely with Local Rule IA 10-2 may		
27		result in the striking of all documents previously filed by the attorney, the imposition of	
28	sanctions, or both. Local Rule IA 10-2(k).		

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner shall have fourteen (14) days from
entry of this order within which to comply with all directives in the prior notices (dkt. nos.
2 & 3) in this matter. If petitioner does not do so, the petition in this matter will be
stricken and the action accordingly will be dismissed without prejudice<sup>1</sup> without further
advance notice.

6	DATED THIS 19 <sup>th</sup> day of April 2013.	
7		
8	ale	
9	MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	<sup>1</sup> While a dismissal would be without prejudice, the pendency of the present	
26	action would not toll the running of the federal limitation period as to a later-filed action. Unless and until overturned, a state court judgment of conviction is presumptively valid; and a babeas petitioner must bear the risk of attorney error that results in a procedural	
27	and a habeas petitioner must bear the risk of attorney error that results in a procedural default. The designation of any dismissal herein as without prejudice thus would not in	
28	any sense connote that petitioner may file a new petition free of any then-applicable procedural bars.	
	2	
I	I	