Cobb v. McDanie	els et al		Doc. 4
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
8	DELBERT COBB,	 	
9	Petitioner,	3:14-cv-00642-RCJ-VPC	
10	vs.	3.11 07 000 12 100 71 0	
11	70.	ORDER	
12	E.K. MCDANIELS, et al.,	ORDER	
13	Respondents.		
14			
15	Petitioner has submitted an application (#1) to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> and a habeas petition.		1.
16	The matter has not been properly commenced because the pauper application does not include		.e
17	all required attachments. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2) and Local Rule LSR1-2, a petitioner must		
18	attach both an inmate account statement for the past six months and a properly executed financial		
19	certificate. Petitioner did not attach a financial certificate or an inmate account statement for the past		
20	six months. The application therefore is incomplete.		
21	Further, petitioner has not submitted his petition on the form required by this court, nor does his		S
22	submission substantially conform to the form. As the form prescribes, a petition shall set forth each		h
23	ground for which petitioner claims his state court conviction and/or sentence is unconstitutional and		d
24	summarize briefly the facts supporting each ground. Legal argument or long lists of case citations are		e
25	not appropriate.		
26	The application for leave to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> therefore will be denied, and the present		ıt
27	action will be dismissed without prejudice to the filing of a new petition in a new action with a pauper		er
28	application on the proper form with all required attachments.		

It does not appear from the papers presented that a dismissal without prejudice will materially affect a later analysis of any timeliness issue with regard to a *promptly* filed new action.¹

IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that the application (#1) to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED** and that this action shall be **DISMISSED without prejudice** to the filing of a new petition in a new action with a properly completed pauper application.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**, as jurists of reason would not find the Court's dismissal of this improperly commenced action without prejudice to be debatable or incorrect.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that the Clerk shall send petitioner two copies each of an application form to proceed *in forma pauperis* for incarcerated persons and a noncapital Section 2254 habeas petition form, one copy of the instructions for each form, and a copy of the papers that he submitted in this action.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly and close this case.

DATED: This 11th day of February, 2015

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹With regard to timeliness, the online docket records of the state courts indicate that the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed the denial of petitioner's state postconviction petition in Case No. 61929 on May 13, 2014, and remittitur issued on June 24, 2014. Petitioner at all times remains responsible for properly exhausting his claims, for calculating the running of the federal limitation period as applied to his case, and for properly commencing a timely-filed federal habeas action.