

1

2

3

4

5

6

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8

\* \* \*

9

GARY JOSEPH WINKLER,

Case No. 3:18-cv-00115-MMD-WGC

10

Petitioner,

ORDER

11

v.

12

ISIDRO BACA, et al.,

13

Respondents.

14

This pro se petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 comes before the Court on Petitioner's motion for production of transcripts. (ECF No. 22.) Specifically, Petitioner seeks a transcript of his September 11, 2015 state postconviction evidentiary hearing. (Id.) While Respondents filed the minutes of the proceeding as part of the relevant state court record, they did not file any transcript of the proceeding. (See Ex. 1 (ECF No. 15-1) at 26-27.) Respondents argue that this is because no transcript has ever been made or requested by Petitioner in state court. (ECF No. 23.) Respondents also appear to suggest that the transcript is not necessary to resolve their motion to dismiss. (See id.) In response, Petitioner filed a "motion to oppose respondents' opposition," which the Court construes as a reply. (ECF No. 24.)

24

In his motion, Petitioner argues in conclusory fashion that the transcript of the evidentiary hearing is necessary to resolve his claims and to rebut Respondents' assertion that some of his claims are not cognizable. In his reply, Petitioner argues more specifically that the transcript will show that his attorneys at sentencing and on direct appeal committed perjury during the evidentiary hearing.

25

26

27

28

1           The Court may order the production of transcripts necessary to resolve the  
2 petitioner's claims. See *Gassler v. Bruton*, 255 F.3d 492, 495 (8th Cir. 2001). However,  
3 the Court is not persuaded, at this juncture at least, that the evidentiary hearing transcript  
4 is necessary. In the motion to dismiss, Respondents assert that several of Petitioner's  
5 claims—all asserting ineffective assistance of postconviction counsel—are not  
6 cognizable. (ECF No. 14 at 11.) Respondents are correct: Errors in state postconviction  
7 proceedings, including ineffective assistance of postconviction counsel, are not  
8 cognizable on federal habeas review. *Franzen v. Brinkman*, 877 F.2d 26, 26 (9th Cir.  
9 1989); see also *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 556-57 (1987). This would include  
10 claims that trial and appellate counsel committed perjury during a postconviction  
11 evidentiary hearing. There cannot be anything in the hearing transcript that could change  
12 this conclusion, and the transcripts are therefore not necessary to respond to  
13 Respondents' argument that some of Petitioner's claims are not cognizable.

14           While conceivable that the transcript might be relevant to deciding Petitioner's  
15 otherwise cognizable claims, the request to produce the transcript is premature. In their  
16 motion to dismiss, Respondents have raised the threshold issue of timeliness. If the  
17 Petition is dismissed as untimely, the Court will not be resolving Petitioner's claims on the  
18 merits. Thus, the transcript of the evidentiary hearing may never be necessary in this  
19 action. Petitioner has not otherwise shown, or even argued, that the transcript contains  
20 information necessary to address the timeliness issue. Accordingly, the request for the  
21 production of a transcript of the evidentiary hearing is premature and will be denied  
22 without prejudice. Petitioner may renew his motion following the Court's ruling on  
23 Respondents' motion to dismiss or if he has additional grounds for asserting the transcript  
24 is necessary to respond to the motion to dismiss.

25           It is therefore ordered that Petitioner's motion for production of transcripts (ECF  
26 No. 22) is denied without prejudice.

27 ///

28 ///

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

It is further ordered that Petitioner’s “motion to oppose respondents’ opposition” (ECF No. 24), construed as a reply, is denied as moot.

DATED THIS 26<sup>th</sup> day of September 2018.



---

MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE