UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

XAVIER FREYTES TORRES, Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 15-C-0247

BRIAN FOSTER, Warden, Green Bay Correctional Institution, Respondent.

<u>ORDER</u>

Xavier Freytes Torres has filed a petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, asserting

that his state court conviction and sentence were imposed in violation of the Constitution.

Pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, I must give the case prompt

initial consideration.

If it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any attached exhibits that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court, the judge must dismiss the petition and direct the clerk to notify the petitioner. If the petition is not dismissed, the judge must order the respondent to file an answer, motion, or other response within a fixed time, or to take other action the judge may order.

Rule 4, Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. Having reviewed the petition, I conclude that it

does not plainly appear that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court.

Accordingly, respondent will be ordered to file a response to the petition.

Petitioner has filed a motion for appointment of counsel. Appointment of counsel

for habeas petitioners is within the district court's discretion and is governed by standards

similar to those followed in civil cases with plaintiffs proceeding in forma pauperis. Wilson

v. Duckworth, 716 F.2d 415, 418 (7th Cir. 1983). When confronted with a request for

counsel in a civil case, the district court must make the following inquiries: (1) has the indigent party made a reasonable attempt to obtain counsel or been effectively precluded from doing so; if so, (2) given the difficulty of the case, does the indigent party appear competent to litigate it himself? <u>Pruitt v. Mote</u>, 503 F.3d 647, 654 (7th Cir. 2007) (en banc). In his motion to appoint counsel, petitioner does not demonstrate that he has made a reasonable attempt to obtain counsel on his own. For that reason, his motion will be denied.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that within 60 days of the date of this order respondent either answer the petition, complying with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, or file a dispositive motion.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall abide by the following schedule regarding the filing of briefs on the merits of petitioner's claims: (1) petitioner shall have 45 days following the filing of respondent's answer within which to file his brief in support of his petition; (2) respondent shall have 45 days following the filing of petitioner's initial brief within which to file a brief in opposition; and (3) petitioner shall have 30 days following the filing of respondent's opposition brief within which to file a reply brief, if any.

In the event that respondent files a dispositive motion and supporting brief in lieu of an answer, this briefing schedule will be suspended and the briefing schedule will be as follows: (1) petitioner shall have 45 days following the filing of respondent's dispositive motion and supporting initial brief within which to file a brief in opposition; and (2) respondent shall have 30 days following the filing of petitioner's opposition brief within which to file a reply brief, if any.

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7(f), the following page limitations apply: briefs in support of or in opposition to the habeas petition or a dispositive motion filed by respondent must not exceed 30 pages and reply briefs must not exceed 15 pages, not counting any statements of facts, exhibits, and affidavits.

Petitioner is advised that he must send copies of all future filings with the court to counsel for respondent, no matter whether in letter, brief, memorandum, or other form.

Pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Attorney General and this court, copies of the petition and this order are being sent today to the Attorney General for the State of Wisconsin for service upon the respondent.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 27th day of March, 2015.

s/ Lynn Adelman

LYNN ADELMAN District Judge