

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 PETER JAMES CARR,

9 Petitioner,

10 v.

11 RONALD HAYNES,

12 Respondent.

Case No. C17-1326-RAJ-MAT

ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER  
LEAVE TO FILE A SECOND  
AMENDED HABEAS PETITION

13  
14 This is a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas action. Petitioner Peter Carr’s amended habeas petition  
15 raises one ground for relief: insufficient evidence. Dkt. 9 at 5. Specifically, he claims that his  
16 “constitutional right to due process was violated when the State of Washington failed to provide  
17 sufficient evidence, at trial, to prove the essential elements of both of the [charged] crimes . . . .”  
18 *Id.* The State’s answer is directed to the sufficiency of the evidence introduced at trial. Dkt. 22.  
19 Petitioner’s response, however, complains that the State did not address his claims that his due  
20 process rights were violated when the police did not collect and turn over exculpatory evidence,  
21 and that his conviction was based on perjured testimony that was elicited through prosecutorial  
22 misconduct. Dkt. 25 at 7-8, 15-16; *see also* Dkt. 9-1 (Appendix to Pet.’s Am. Pet.). He also  
23 complains about the adequacy of the jury instructions, which he alleges the jury did not understand.

ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER  
LEAVE TO FILE A SECOND AMENDED  
HABEAS PETITION - 1

1 Dkt. 25 at 18-20. Each of these issues falls outside the scope of a challenge based on the  
2 sufficiency of the evidence, which is the only federal habeas claim properly raised here.<sup>1</sup>

3 Given petitioner's *pro se* status, the Court GRANTS him leave to file, **within 30 days** of  
4 the date of this Order, an amended habeas petition that adds any additional claims he intended to  
5 raise. Petitioner is reminded that the Court may consider only federal habeas claims that have been  
6 exhausted in the state courts and are not barred by the statute of limitations. In addition, petitioner  
7 is advised that an amended petition acts as a *complete substitute* for all previously filed petitions;  
8 thus it must include *all* of his federal habeas claims.

9 If petitioner does not file a second amended petition, the Court will address his sufficiency  
10 of the evidence claim on the current record. If petitioner does file a second amended petition,  
11 respondent shall file a supplemental answer within 30 days and re-note the original answer  
12 accordingly to allow petitioner time to respond.

13 The Clerk is directed to RE-NOTE respondent's answer, Dkt. 22, for 30 days from the date  
14 of this order, send petitioner the proper forms so he may file a second amended petition, and direct  
15 copies of this Order to the parties and to the Honorable Richard A. Jones.

16 Dated this 6th day of February, 2018.

17  
18   
19 Mary Alice Theiler  
United States Magistrate Judge

20 <sup>1</sup> In reviewing a claim of insufficiency of the evidence to support a conviction, a federal habeas court must  
21 view the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution. *See Gordon v. Duran*, 895 F.2d 610, 612 (9th Cir.  
22 1990). Evidence is sufficient if "any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond  
23 a reasonable doubt." *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979). Thus the jury is entitled to believe the State's  
evidence and to disbelieve the defense's evidence. *Wright v. West*, 505 U.S. 277, 296 (1992). On habeas review, "a  
federal court may not overturn a state court decision rejecting a sufficiency of the evidence challenge simply because  
the federal court disagrees with the state court. The federal court instead may do so only if the state court decision  
was 'objectively unreasonable.'" *Coleman v. Johnson*, 566 U.S. 650, 132 S. Ct. 2060, 2062 (2012) (per curiam)  
(quoting *Cavazos v. Smith*, 565 U.S. 1 (2011) (quoted source omitted)).