

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

WILLIAM WORKMAN,

Petitioner,

Case No. 3:17-cv-00508-MMD-VPC

ORDER

v.

ISIDRO BACA, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Petitioner William Workman submitted a *pro se* 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for a writ of habeas corpus and has now paid the filing fee (*see* ECF Nos. 1-1, 11). The Court has reviewed the petition pursuant to Habeas Rule 4, and it will be docketed and served on respondents.

A petition for federal habeas corpus should include all claims for relief of which petitioner is aware. If petitioner fails to include such a claim in his petition, he may be forever barred from seeking federal habeas relief upon that claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. §2254(b) (successive petitions). If petitioner is aware of any claim not included in his petition, he should notify the Court of that as soon as possible, perhaps by means of a motion to amend his petition to add the claim.

It is therefore ordered that the Clerk file and electronically serve the petition (ECF No. 1-1) on the respondents.

It is further ordered that the Clerk add Adam Paul Laxalt, Nevada Attorney General, as counsel for respondents.

1 It is further ordered that respondents must file a response to the petition, including
2 potentially by motion to dismiss, within ninety (90) days of service of the petition, with any
3 requests for relief by petitioner by motion otherwise being subject to the normal briefing
4 schedule under the local rules. Any response filed must comply with the remaining
5 provisions below, which are entered pursuant to Habeas Rule 5.

6 It is further ordered that any procedural defenses raised by respondents in this
7 case must be raised together in a single consolidated motion to dismiss. In other words,
8 the Court does not wish to address any procedural defenses raised herein either *in*
9 *seriatum* fashion in multiple successive motions to dismiss or embedded in the answer.
10 Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to potential
11 waiver. Respondents must not file a response in this case that consolidates their
12 procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to 28
13 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit. If respondents
14 do seek dismissal of unexhausted claims under § 2254(b)(2): (a) they shall do so within
15 the single motion to dismiss not in the answer; and (b) they shall specifically direct their
16 argument to the standard for dismissal under § 2254(b)(2) set forth in *Cassett v. Stewart*,
17 406 F.3d 614, 623-24 (9th Cir. 2005). In short, no procedural defenses, including
18 exhaustion, will be included with the merits in an answer. All procedural defenses,
19 including exhaustion, instead must be raised by motion to dismiss.

20 It is further ordered that, in any answer filed on the merits, respondents must
21 specifically cite to and address the applicable state court written decision and state court
22 record materials, if any, regarding each claim within the response as to that claim.

23 It is further ordered that petitioner will have forty-five (45) days from service of the
24 answer, motion to dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition, with any other
25 requests for relief by respondents by motion otherwise being subject to the normal briefing
26 schedule under the local rules.


27 It is further ordered that any additional state court record exhibits filed herein by
28 either petitioner or respondents must be filed with a separate index of exhibits identifying

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

the exhibits by number. The CM/ECF attachments that are filed further must be identified by the number of the exhibit in the attachment.

It is further ordered that the parties must send courtesy copies of all exhibits in this case to the Clerk of Court, 400 S. Virginia St., Reno, NV, 89501, directed to the attention of "Staff Attorney" on the outside of the mailing address label. Additionally, in the future, all parties must provide courtesy copies of any additional exhibits submitted to the Court in this case, in the manner described above.

DATED THIS 6th day of April 2018.



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE