v. Baca et al	Do
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 DIS	TRICT OF NEVADA
10	
DAMIAN HALL,	
Petitioner,	Case No. 3:14-cv-00613-RCJ-WGC
13 vs.	ORDER
MR. BACA, et al.,	
Respondents.	
Following upon the notice (#7)	of appearance by petitioner's counsel in this habeas matter,
17	Sederal Public Defender's Office is appointed as counsel for
18	A(a)(2)(B), with Melanie Gavisk, Esq., appearing as petitioner's
counsel of record.	A(a)(2)(b), with Melanic Gavisk, Esq., appearing as petitioner's
20	that petitioner shall have until up to and including one hundred
21	
22	rder within which to file an amended petition and/or seek other
23	g deadline nor any extension thereof signifies or will signify any
24	the federal limitation period and/or of a basis for tolling during
25	r at all times remains responsible for calculating the running of
26	y asserting claims, without regard to any deadlines established
27	y setting a deadline to amend the petition and/or by granting any
extension thereof, the court makes no	o finding or representation that the petition, any amendments
II .	

thereto, and/or any claims contained therein are not subject to dismissal as untimely. *See Sossa v. Diaz*, 729 F.3d 1225, 1235 (9th Cir. 2013).

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that respondents shall file a response to the amended petition, including potentially by motion to dismiss, within sixty (60) days of service of the amended petition, with any requests for relief by petitioner by motion otherwise being subject to the normal briefing schedule under the local rules. Any response filed shall comply with the remaining provisions below, which are entered pursuant to Habeas Rule 4.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that any procedural defenses raised by respondents in this case shall be raised together in a single consolidated motion to dismiss. In other words, the court does not wish to address any procedural defenses raised herein either in *seriatum* fashion in multiple successive motions to dismiss or embedded in the answer. Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to potential waiver. Respondents shall not file a response in this case that consolidates their procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If respondents do seek dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they shall do so within the single motion to dismiss <u>not</u> in the answer; and (b) they shall specifically direct their argument to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set forth in *Cassett v. Stewart*, 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005). In short, no procedural defenses, including exhaustion, shall be included with the merits in an answer. All procedural defenses, including exhaustion, instead must be raised by motion to dismiss.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that, in any answer filed on the merits, respondents shall specifically cite to and address the applicable state court written decision and state court record materials, if any, regarding each claim within the response as to that claim.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that petitioner shall have thirty (30) days from service of the answer, motion to dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition, with any other requests for relief by respondents by motion otherwise being subject to the normal briefing schedule under the local rules.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that any additional state court record exhibits filed herein by either petitioner or respondents shall be filed with a separate index of exhibits identifying the exhibits by number. The CM/ECF attachments that are filed further shall be identified by the number or numbers of the exhibits in the attachment.

Dated: This 25th day of March, 2015.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE