

According to the habeas petition, petitioner's judgment of conviction was entered on 1 2 August 21, 1990. Petitioner did not file a direct appeal. He filed a state habeas petition on March 24, 3 1994 and states that he did not appeal the denial of that petition to the Nevada Supreme Court (ECF #1-1 4 at 1). However, petitioner has filed a motion to amend that does not have a proposed amended petition 5 attached, but that states that he filed a state habeas petition on March 16, 1994 (ECF #6 at 2). He further 6 states that the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed the denial of the petition, and remittitur issued on July 7 16, 1995 (id.). The instant federal habeas petition was handed to a correctional officer for mailing on 8 March 5, 2013. Thus, while it is entirely unclear what if any post-conviction filings petitioner presented 9 to the state district court and the Nevada Supreme Court, it appears impossible that the federal petition 10 was filed within the one-year time limitation contained in the statute.<sup>1</sup> 11 Petitioner may be entitled to equitable tolling of the one-year limitations period if he can 12 establish that he diligently pursued his right and some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way. See

*Calderon v. United States District Court (Beeler)*, 128 F.3d 1283, 1288 (9th Cir. 1997), *overruled in part on other grounds, Calderon v. United States District Court (Kelly)*, 163 F.3d 530 (9th Cir. 1998); *Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 418 (2005). The petitioner will be given the opportunity to show
that either the instant petition was not filed beyond the one-year statute of limitations, or that he is
entitled to equitable tolling of the time limitation.

- 18IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner shall have thirty (30) days from the19date of entry of this order to show cause and file such proof he may have to demonstrate that the petition20for writ of habeas corpus was timely filed within the one-year time limitation or that he is entitled to21equitable tolling of the time period. He shall also set forth a complete and accurate history, with dates,
- 22
- <sup>1</sup> Petitioner's judgment of conviction, entered on August 21, 1990, pre-dated the effective date
  of the relevant amendments to AEDPA, April 24, 1996. Yet a case is not "pending" until an actual
  habeas petition is filed in federal court. *Woodford v. Garceau*, 538 U.S. 202, 207 (2003). Accordingly,
  petitioner's federal petition is subject to these amendments because the petition was not filed until after
  AEDPA's effective date.
- 26

1	of any state postconviction proceedings presented to the state district court and the Nevada Supreme
2	Court, including direct appeal and state habeas petitions.
3	<b>IT IS FURTHER ORDERED</b> that if petitioner is unable to demonstrate that the petition
4	for writ of habeas corpus was filed within the limitations period, the court will enter an order dismissing
5	the petition.
6	
7	Dated: This 16 <sup>th</sup> day of September, 2013.
8	$\mathcal{D}$
9	UNITED STATES DETDICT HUDGE
10	UNITED STATES PISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26	3