

challenges the imposition of a term of supervised release that ultimately was revoked and is the subject of his current appeal.

Based on concepts of judicial economy and due to concerns about the risk of inconsistent decisions, this Court should not entertain a collateral attack on a judgment while a direct appeal is pending absent "extraordinary circumstances" not present here. *United States v. Deeb*, 944 F.2d 545, 548 (9th Cir. 1991); *United States v. Taylor*, 648 F.2d 565, 572 (9th Cir. 1981). Therefore, Defendant's § 2255 Motion is hereby **STAYED** pending conclusion of his direct appeal of the Judgment revoking his supervised release.

Because the Defendant's § 2255 Motion is no longer pending, he does not have a need for his case file from his prior attorney. The Ninth Circuit has appointed new counsel for the appeal who may, if needed, obtain the file from prior counsel. If so, the Defendant has access to the file without the necessity of this Court directing prior counsel to provide it directly to the Defendant.

Defendant's Motion to Compel Prior Counsel to Supply Defendant's Case File is **DENIED** and Defendant's Second Motion for an Extension of Time to File an Amended § 2255

Motion is **DENIED** as **MOOT**. Defendant's § 2255 Motion is **STAYED** pending conclusion of his direct appeal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Clerk shall send uncertified copies of this order to all counsel of record, and to any party appearing pro se.

Dated this Uday of April, 2011.

Ronald B. Leighton

United States District Judge