

# **Table of Contents**

## **CHAPTER 1. JURISDICTION AND RELATED MATTERS**

### **I. THE CUSTODY REQUIREMENT**

#### **A. IN GENERAL**

- § 1:1 The rule
- § 1:2 “Custody” defined
- § 1:3 Requirement is jurisdictional
- § 1:4 Timing of when custody requirement must be satisfied
- § 1:5 Custody requirement applies to both citizens and aliens
- § 1:6 Petitioner’s claim must involve the right to be released and provide a nexus
- § 1:7 Each claim must be analyzed separately

#### **B. APPLICATION OF THE CUSTODY REQUIREMENT**

##### **1. Circumstances Where Custody Requirement is Satisfied**

- § 1:8 Incarceration
- § 1:9 Probation and parole
- § 1:10 Detention on a parole warrant, bail or o/r release
- § 1:11 Rehabilitation
- § 1:12 Consecutive sentences
- § 1:13 Concurrent sentences
- § 1:14 Suspended or stayed sentences
- § 1:15 Community service
- § 1:16 Awaiting execution of sentence
- § 1:17 Petitioner ordered deported
- § 1:18 Commitment to mental institution
- § 1:19 Civil commitment

##### **2. Circumstances Where Custody Requirement is Not Satisfied**

- § 1:20 Fines
- § 1:21 Restitution
- § 1:22 Sexual offender and narcotics registration / protection orders
- § 1:23 Deportation

- § 1:24 Fugitives
- § 1:25 Licenses and other privileges
- § 1:26 Economic loss
- § 1:27 Expired prior conviction or parole revocation

## II. SUBJECT MATTER

### A. FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION

#### 1. Federal Prisoners

- § 1:28 Section 2255
- § 1:29 Section 2241
- § 1:30 Error *Coram Nobis*
- § 1:31 *Audita Querela*
- § 1:32 Civil rights remedies
- § 1:33 Terrorism statutes

#### 2. State Prisoners

- § 1:34 Sections 2241 and 2254
- § 1:35 Availability of habeas for claims that do not necessarily invalidate the duration of confinement

### B. COGNIZABILITY

#### 1. Federal Prisoners

- § 1:36 Generally
- § 1:37 Constitutional Violations
- § 1:38 Federal law violations
- § 1:39 Treaty violations

#### 2. State Prisoners

##### a. Generally

- § 1:40 Overview
- § 1:41 Constitutional violations
- § 1:42 Federal law violations
- § 1:43 Treaty violations

##### b. State Law Violations

- § 1:44 Generally
- § 1:45 Fundamentally unfair trial
- § 1:46 State created liberty interests
- § 1:47 Unexpected departure in state law
- § 1:48 Disparate treatment
- § 1:49 Arbitrary or capricious

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### 3. Fourth Amendment Claims

- § 1:50 Generally
- § 1:51 The “full and fair opportunity” standard
- § 1:52 Review of the state court’s legal conclusions
- § 1:53 —Erroneous legal analysis
- § 1:54 —Closed mind exception
- § 1:55 —State court ignores fourth amendment claim
- § 1:56 Review of the state court’s factual findings
- § 1:57 Intervening fourth amendment decisions
- § 1:58 *Stone* does not apply to the government
- § 1:59 Application of *Stone* in other contexts
- § 1:60 *Stone* applies to state and federal prosecutions

### 4. Other Grounds

- § 1:61 Newly discovered evidence of innocence and “freestanding” innocence claims
- § 1:62 Ineffective assistance of counsel on collateral review
- § 1:63 Waiver of right to direct appeal and collateral review
- § 1:64 Preplea constitutional violations
- § 1:65 Challenge to a prior conviction used to enhance a current sentence

## C. MOOTNESS

- § 1:66 Conclusory allegations
- § 1:67 Case-or-controversy requirement
- § 1:68 Incarceration, parole, probation, or supervised release
- § 1:69 Parole or probation revocation challenges
- § 1:70 Challenges to prison disciplinary and administrative actions
- § 1:71 Post-incarceration, parole, or probation challenges
- § 1:72 —Challenges to a criminal conviction
- § 1:73 —Challenges to a completed sentence
- § 1:74 State court actions resulting in mootness
- § 1:75 Deportation
- § 1:76 Civil commitment: Sexually violent offender statutes
- § 1:77 Fines and restitution
- § 1:78 Death of petitioner
- § 1:79 Institution of retrial proceedings following grant of habeas relief
- § 1:80 Mootness exception: Capable of evading review
- § 1:81 Pretrial detention preceding conviction
- § 1:82 Standard of review

### **III. STANDING**

#### **A. IN GENERAL**

§ 1:83 Overview

#### **B. TYPES**

§ 1:84 Article III

§ 1:85 Prudential

§ 1:86 —Third party standing

§ 1:87 —“Next friend” standing

#### **C. DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN ARTICLE III AND PRUDENTIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

§ 1:88 Prudential considerations subject to modification by Congress

§ 1:89 Prudential considerations regarded as flexible

§ 1:90 Are prudential considerations waivable?

#### **D. OTHER ISSUES**

§ 1:91 Burden

§ 1:92 Standard of review

### **IV. NAMING THE PROPER RESPONDENT (A.K.A. PERSONAL JURISDICTION)**

§ 1:93 Federal prisoners

§ 1:94 State prisoners

§ 1:95 Special circumstances—Prisoner incarcerated in state other than the one of conviction

§ 1:96 —Prisoner incarcerated in one state, but subject to detainer issued by another state

§ 1:97 —Prisoner obtained by a writ of habeas corpus ad prosequendum

§ 1:98 —Prisoner challenging a conviction or sentence enhanced by a prior conviction from a different state

§ 1:99 Consequence of improperly named respondent: Transfer or dismissal

§ 1:100 Waiver

§ 1:101 Substitution of public officers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**V. IDENTIFYING THE PROPER DISTRICT COURT  
(A.K.A. VENUE)**

**A. FEDERAL PRISONERS**

§ 1:102 Generally

**B. STATE PRISONERS**

§ 1:103 Generally

§ 1:104 Special circumstances—Effect of prisoner’s transfer to  
another state during pendency of federal petition

§ 1:105 —When prisoner’s residence determines court with  
personal jurisdiction

**C. TRANSFERS**

§ 1:106 Transfers to another district within the same state  
(state prisoners)

§ 1:107 Petition filed in a district without territorial  
jurisdiction

§ 1:108 Transfers for the convenience of parties and  
witnesses

**D. WAIVER**

§ 1:109 Generally

**VI. ABSTENTION**

§ 1:110 *Younger* doctrine

§ 1:111 —*Younger* test

§ 1:112 —Dismissal versus stay

§ 1:113 *Colorado River* doctrine

§ 1:114 *Pullman* doctrine

**VII. RIPENESS**

§ 1:115 Generally

**VIII. ADVISORY OPINIONS**

§ 1:116 Generally

**IX. *ROOKER-FELDMAN* DOCTRINE**

§ 1:117 Generally

## CHAPTER 2. THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN HABEAS CORPUS AND CIVIL RIGHTS AND SIMILAR ACTIONS

### I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- § 2:1 The *Heck* rule
- § 2:2 Jurisdiction
- § 2:3 Careful comparison between claim and conviction
- § 2:4 Partial acquittals
- § 2:5 *Heck* not limited to § 1983 claims
- § 2:6 No damages for imprisonment justified by a valid, unchallenged conviction and sentence
- § 2:7 *Heck* inapplicable when plaintiff's conviction does not share a common nucleus of operative facts with the § 1983 claim
- § 2:8 Vacating a conviction pursuant to a settlement agreement constitutes a “favorable termination” under *Heck*
- § 2:9 Parties barred by *Heck*
- § 2:10 Interlocutory appeal
- § 2:11 Prospective relief excluded
- § 2:12 Some claims fall outside *Heck*'s ambit when a conviction is merely “anticipated”
- § 2:13 Pre-trial diversion and the conviction requirement
- § 2:14 *Nolo contendere* pleas
- § 2:15 Dismissal of improper claims
- § 2:16 Waiver and bypass
- § 2:17 Application of § 1983 where habeas unavailable
- § 2:18 Application of *Heck* to challenges by federal prisoners
- § 2:19 *Heck* not a rule of evidence exclusion

### II. HECK APPLIED

- § 2:20 Trial claims
- § 2:21 Fourth and Fifth Amendment claims
- § 2:22 —Search and seizure
- § 2:23 —Excessive force
- § 2:24 —Coerced confessions
- § 2:25 —Fourth Amendment malicious prosecution claims
- § 2:26 Method of execution claims
- § 2:27 Prison disciplinary proceedings
- § 2:28 State parole proceedings
- § 2:29 Place of detention
- § 2:30 Extradition

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:31 Civil commitments
- § 2:32 Biological testing
- § 2:33 Claims based on alleged violations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations
- § 2:34 Claims based on conditions of confinement
- § 2:35 Claims based on overdetention

## CHAPTER 3. AEDPA REVIEW STANDARDS

### I. PRE-AEDPA CASES

- § 3:1 Deference limited to state court factual findings

### II. POST-AEDPA CASES

- § 3:2 The statute and general principles
- § 3:3 Cases governed by AEDPA

### III. QUESTIONS OF LAW / MIXED QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT

#### A. METHODOLOGY

- § 3:4 Purely legal and mixed questions of law distinguished
- § 3:5 Court may proceed directly to AEDPA analysis without first deciding whether state court's decision was wrong

#### B. MERITS ADJUDICATION

- § 3:6 The statute
- § 3:7 The “merits adjudication” requirement
- § 3:8 A “claim”
- § 3:9 Unexplained state court decisions
- § 3:10 State court denies state-law claim without explicitly addressing related federal-law claim
- § 3:11 Components of a claim
- § 3:12 Omitted claims and arguments
- § 3:13 Ambiguous state court opinions
- § 3:14 Federal claim addressed in a different context
- § 3:15 No prima facie showing
- § 3:16 Plain error review
- § 3:17 Lack of exhaustion
- § 3:18 Procedurally defaulted claims
- § 3:19 Alternative procedural and merits adjudications
- § 3:20 State court's failure to develop the record
- § 3:21 Lower state court adjudications
- § 3:22 Partial state court adjudications

- § 3:23 Significance of the last reasoned decision and application of the look-through doctrine
- § 3:24 —Summary denials
- § 3:25 —Multiple state court reasoned decisions
- § 3:26 Harmless error analysis

### C. “CLEARLY ESTABLISHED”

- § 3:27 The rule
- § 3:28 Threshold determination
- § 3:29 Temporality requirement
- § 3:30 United States supreme court precedent drives the § 2254(d)(1) inquiry
- § 3:31 Relevance of *Teague* principles
- § 3:32 Breadth of the “clearly established” limitation
- § 3:33 Supreme court holdings, not dicta
- § 3:34 Plurality and concurring opinions
- § 3:35 Non-constitutional supreme court rulings insufficient
- § 3:36 Questions expressly reserved by the supreme court
- § 3:37 Friction between supreme court cases
- § 3:38 Lower court decisions not necessarily irrelevant
- § 3:39 Lower court decision based on supreme court decisions not itself sufficient
- § 3:40 The “clearly established” requirement applies to treaty violations
- § 3:41 Illustrative cases

### D. “CONTRARY TO”

- § 3:42 Overview
- § 3:43 Defined
- § 3:44 No citation to, or even awareness of, controlling authority required
- § 3:45 State court applies state standard that is the functional equivalent to, or stricter than, the federal standard
- § 3:46 State court’s use of imprecise or shorthand language in describing controlling legal standard
- § 3:47 State court decisions applying the correct rule are reviewed under the “unreasonable application” clause
- § 3:48 The addition, deletion, or alteration of a factor in a clearly established supreme court test
- § 3:49 Reasoning demonstrates that the state court applied an incorrect legal standard
- § 3:50 Consequence of “contrary to” determination
- § 3:51 Illustrative cases



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### E. “UNREASONABLE APPLICATION”

- § 3:52 Generally
- § 3:53 “Unreasonable application” defined
- § 3:54 —Court of appeals elaboration
- § 3:55 —Specificity of the rule affects the “reasonableness” determination
- § 3:56 —State court’s unique ability to assess the merits of the claim
- § 3:57 —Closeness of the issue
- § 3:58 Extension of precedent
- § 3:59 Erroneous or incorrect application of controlling precedent not enough
- § 3:60 “Clearly erroneous” state court adjudication not the same as an “unreasonable” one
- § 3:61 Lower court decisions not irrelevant
- § 3:62 Conflicting authorities
- § 3:63 Absence of supreme court authority as demonstrating reasonableness
- § 3:64 Reasonableness of state court decision assessed in light of the record before it
- § 3:65 Consequence of unreasonable state court merits adjudication
- § 3:66 Effect of erroneous underlying factual finding or objectively unreasonable factual determination
- § 3:67 Section 2254(d)(1) deference does not apply to pro-petitioner state court adjudications
- § 3:68 State court adjudication dependent on an antecedent unreasonable application of federal law
- § 3:69 Relief based on supreme court precedent that is no longer good law
- § 3:70 Significance of the reasoning employed by the state court
- § 3:71 Illustrative cases

### F. CONSTITUTIONALITY

- § 3:72 No provisions found unconstitutional

## IV. QUESTIONS OF FACT

### A. ADJUDICATION

- § 3:73 Generally
- § 3:74 Types of facts
- § 3:75 Explicit and implicit findings
- § 3:76 State appellate court findings

- § 3:77 Ambiguous state court record
- § 3:78 Absence of state court record
- § 3:79 Mixed questions of law and fact

## **B. DEFERENCE AFFORDED**

- § 3:80 The statute
- § 3:81 The strength of the presumption of correctness can vary with the circumstances
- § 3:82 Relationship between § 2254(d)(2) and (e)(1)
- § 3:83 Deference applied
- § 3:84 —Intrinsic challenges
- § 3:85 —Extrinsic challenges
- § 3:86 All conflicts in testimony resolved
- § 3:87 Effect of conflicting state trial and appellate court factual findings
- § 3:88 What constitutes “evidence presented in the state court proceeding” within the meaning of § 2254(d)(2)
- § 3:89 Effect of the passage of time between event and the making of the factual finding
- § 3:90 Change in circumstances underlying competency finding
- § 3:91 Deference limited to judicial findings

## **C. OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO FACTUAL FINDINGS**

- § 3:92 Documentary evidence
- § 3:93 No written findings required
- § 3:94 Full and fair hearing requirement
- § 3:95 Effect of erroneous factual finding
- § 3:96 Obligation to review state court record

## **V. WAIVER**

- § 3:97 Generally

## **VI. FEDERAL APPELLATE STANDARDS OF REVIEW**

- § 3:98 “Contrary to”/“Unreasonable application of” determination
- § 3:99 Findings of fact

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**CHAPTER 4. EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS**

**I. EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS ON PRISONERS' CLAIMS**

- § 4:1 State prisoners, generally
- § 4:2 Federal prisoners, generally

**II. SIGNIFICANCE OF A STATE COURT MERITS ADJUDICATION**

- § 4:3 Evidence limited to the record before the state court
- § 4:4 Exceptions to the bar against the receipt of new evidence

**III. FAILURE TO DEVELOP FACTUAL BASIS IN STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS**

- § 4:5 Generally
- § 4:6 Evolution of the failure to develop restriction
- § 4:7 Diligence
- § 4:8 Exception—Where new rule/unavailable factual predicate and actual innocence
- § 4:9 —New evidence that does not concern the merits of the claim
- § 4:10 Diligence a question of fact
- § 4:11 Waiver

**IV. WHETHER AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING IS APPROPRIATE OR REQUIRED**

**A. EVIDENTIARY HEARING MANDATORY**

- § 4:12 The *Townsend* factors
- § 4:13 The petitioner has alleged grounds for relief under AEDPA's deferential review standards

**B. EVIDENTIARY HEARING DISCRETIONARY**

- § 4:14 Governing standards

**V. OTHER LIMITATIONS ON ENTITLEMENT TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

- § 4:15 Alleged facts, even if true, would not entitle petitioner to relief
- § 4:16 Failure to demonstrate how an evidentiary hearing will further the claim

- § 4:17 No disputed facts
- § 4:18 Purely legal issue
- § 4:19 Conclusory allegations
- § 4:20 Patently frivolous
- § 4:21 Self-serving declarations
- § 4:22 Claim can be resolved on existing record
- § 4:23 Submission of sworn motion or affidavit requirement

## **VI. EXPANSION OF THE RECORD IN LIEU OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

- § 4:24 Generally

## **VII. EVIDENTIARY HEARING PROCEDURES**

- § 4:25 Timing of the evidentiary hearing
- § 4:26 Appointment of counsel
- § 4:27 Prisoner's attendance
- § 4:28 Subpoenas
- § 4:29 Prehearing conference
- § 4:30 Evidentiary rules
- § 4:31 Scope of federal evidentiary hearing

## **VIII. STATE COURT AFFORDED AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONDUCT THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

- § 4:32 Generally

## **IX. FEDERAL APPELLATE STANDARD OF REVIEW**

- § 4:33 Generally

# **CHAPTER 5. EXPANSION OF THE RECORD**

## **I. GOVERNING STANDARDS**

- § 5:1 State prisoners
- § 5:2 Federal prisoners

## **II. PURPOSES**

- § 5:3 Obviate need for evidentiary hearing
- § 5:4 To assist the court when an evidentiary hearing is ordered

## **III. RESTRICTIONS**

- § 5:5 Petitioner's failure to develop factual basis in state court proceedings

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:6 State court adjudicated petitioner's claim on the merits
- § 5:7 Relevant materials
- § 5:8 Credibility issues
- § 5:9 Post-evidentiary hearing requests

## **IV. LEAVE OF COURT PRIOR TO SUBMITTING MATERIALS NOT REQUIRED**

- § 5:10 Generally

## **V. FEDERAL APPELLATE STANDARD OF REVIEW**

- § 5:11 Generally

## **CHAPTER 6. DISCOVERY**

### **I. THE RULE**

- § 6:1 State prisoners
- § 6:2 Federal prisoners
- § 6:3 Purpose
- § 6:4 Federal appellate standard of review

### **II. SHOWING REQUIRED**

- § 6:5 Good cause
- § 6:6 Specific showing
- § 6:7 Not to be used to conduct fishing expeditions
- § 6:8 Effect of prior state court ruling denying discovery

### **III. PROCEDURE**

- § 6:9 Types of discovery
- § 6:10 Timing of discovery
- § 6:11 Attorney-client privilege, waiver, and protective orders

### **IV. RESTRICTIONS**

- § 6:12 Petitioner's failure to develop factual basis in state court proceedings
- § 6:13 Unexhausted claims
- § 6:14 *Ex Parte* Requests for Discovery Generally Prohibited
- § 6:15 Needlessly prolonging proceedings

## **CHAPTER 7. THE *TEAGUE* RULE**

### **I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

- § 7:1 The rule

- § 7:2 When *Teague* is addressed by the court relative to other issues
- § 7:3 *Teague* applies to both state and federal prisoners
- § 7:4 *Teague* applies to both capital and non-capital cases
- § 7:5 *Teague* defense available to the state, but not prisoners
- § 7:6 *Teague* rule and its application to state courts

## II. *TEAGUE* LIMITED TO PROCEDURAL RULES

- § 7:7 New substantive rules
- § 7:8 Statutory procedural rules

## III. THE PARTIES' BURDENS

- § 7:9 The state's burden of raising the defense
- § 7:10 The prisoner's burden of establishing that the rule is not new
- § 7:11 Federal court may raise *Teague sua sponte*

## IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AEDPA AND *TEAGUE*

- § 7:12 *Teague* Survives Enactment of AEDPA
- § 7:13 *Teague* Guides What Is "Clearly Established" Law under AEDPA
- § 7:14 Circumstances Where *Teague* Affords Less Protection to State Judgments Than AEDPA
- § 7:15 Circumstances where *Teague* affords less protection to state judgments than AEDPA—Source of precedent under AEDPA more restrictive
  - § 7:16 —Pre-finality state court adjudications
  - § 7:17 —The *Teague* exceptions
  - § 7:18 —Waiver
- § 7:19 Circumstances where *Teague* affords greater protection to state judgments than AEDPA
  - § 7:20 —No merits adjudication by a state court
  - § 7:21 —State court decision contrary to supreme court authority
  - § 7:22 —Post-finality state court adjudications
  - § 7:23 —Pre-AEDPA federal petitions

## V. THE METHODOLOGY OF APPLYING *TEAGUE*

- § 7:24 Three-step approach

### A. ASCERTAINING THE DATE OF FINALITY

- § 7:25 Method of determination

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### B. DETERMINING WHETHER THE RULE PETITIONER SEEKS TO APPLY WAS DICTATED BY PRECEDENT AS OF THE DATE OF FINALITY

- § 7:26 Generally
- § 7:27 Various formulations of what constitutes a “new” rule
- § 7:28 Factors to consider
- § 7:29 —The underlying supreme court decision itself
- § 7:30 —Supreme court decisions rendered after the  
underlying supreme court decision
- § 7:31 —Opinions of lower state and federal courts
- § 7:32 —Institutionalized practices
- § 7:33 Can lower federal courts establish “new rules”?
- § 7:34 Deeply embedded rules not “new”
- § 7:35 Availability of claim under state law insufficient
- § 7:36 Rules of general application applied to new facts not  
“new rules”

### C. EXCEPTIONS TO THE APPLICATION OF *TEAGUE*

- § 7:37 The two exceptions
- § 7:38 —New substantive rules
- § 7:39 —Watershed rules of criminal procedure

## VI. *TEAGUE* APPLIED

- § 7:40 Leading *Teague* cases

## CHAPTER 8. DISTRICT COURT PLEADINGS AND PRACTICE

### I. THE § 2254 PETITION OR § 2255 MOTION

#### A. FORM AND SUBSTANCE

- § 8:1 State prisoners
- § 8:2 Federal prisoners
- § 8:3 Specificity in pleadings
- § 8:4 Preliminary consideration by judge

#### B. FILING REQUIREMENTS

- § 8:5 State prisoners
- § 8:6 Federal prisoners

**C. MANNER OF INTERPRETATION**

§ 8:7 Liberal construction of *pro se* pleadings

**D. INCORPORATION OF FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS**

§ 8:8 Permissible and impermissible uses

**E. SERVICE REQUIREMENTS**

§ 8:9 Governing rules

**II. PROCEEDING *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* IN DISTRICT COURT**

§ 8:10 State prisoners

§ 8:11 Federal prisoners

§ 8:12 Limited to natural persons

§ 8:13 Extent of indigency required

§ 8:14 Untrue poverty allegations

§ 8:15 Right to immediate appeal

**III. TRANSCRIPTS AND RECORDS**

**A. DISTRICT COURT DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS**

§ 8:16 Rights of prisoner granted *in forma pauperis* status

**B. TRANSCRIPTS**

§ 8:17 State prisoners

§ 8:18 Federal prisoners

§ 8:19 Transcript of proceeding before magistrate judge

**C. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND SERVICES**

§ 8:20 No constitutional right

§ 8:21 Statutory right

**IV. SUMMARY DISMISSALS**

**A. DISTRICT COURT DISMISSALS**

§ 8:22 Summary dismissal standards

§ 8:23 Timing

**B. GOVERNMENT DISMISSAL MOTIONS**

§ 8:24 Permissibility



TABLE OF CONTENTS

**V. MOTION FOR A MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT**

§ 8:25 Standards

**VI. ANSWER**

**A. WHEN GOVERNMENT IS OBLIGED TO ANSWER**

§ 8:26 Overview

**B. FORM AND SUBSTANCE**

§ 8:27 Section 2254 cases—State prisoners

§ 8:28 Section 2255 motions—Federal prisoners

**C. SUFFICIENCY OF THE ANSWER**

§ 8:29 Response to allegations

**D. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

§ 8:30 Obligation to assert

§ 8:31 Consequences of failure to allege affirmative defense

§ 8:32 Amendment to allege an affirmative defense

**E. TRANSCRIPTS**

§ 8:33 Overview

**F. SERVICE**

§ 8:34 Documents subject to service on petitioner

**VII. REPLY (FORMERLY TRAVERSE) AND SUR-REPLY**

§ 8:35 Habeas Rule 5

**VIII. MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

§ 8:36 Rule 56

**IX. MOTION TO AMEND**

**A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

§ 8:37 Rule 15(a)

§ 8:38 Application of Rule 15 to habeas corpus actions

## **B. POLICY FAVORING AMENDMENT**

### **1. In General**

§ 8:39 Overview

§ 8:40 Burdens

### **2. Factors That Guide the Court's Discretion**

§ 8:41 Overview

§ 8:42 Undue delay

§ 8:43 Futility

§ 8:44 Prejudice to opposing party

§ 8:45 Previous efforts to amend

### **3. Effect of Rule 16 Scheduling Orders**

§ 8:46 Generally

## **C. APPELLATE REVIEW STANDARDS**

§ 8:47 Overview

## **X. NOTICE OF RELATED CASES**

§ 8:48 Overview

## **XI. MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

§ 8:49 Governing standards

## **XII. CERTIFICATION OF QUESTION TO STATE'S HIGHEST COURT**

§ 8:50 Appropriateness

## **XIII. ABANDONMENT OF PETITION**

§ 8:51 Governing standards

## **XIV. DISMISSAL FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE OR COMPLY WITH FEDERAL RULES OR COURT ORDERS**

§ 8:52 Governing standards

## **XV. MAGISTRATE JUDGE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE**

### **A. THE ROLE OF MAGISTRATE JUDGES GENERALLY**

§ 8:53 The assignment of cases to magistrate judges

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:54 Limited authority of magistrate judges

### **B. CONSENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE ENTERING FINAL, APPEALABLE JUDGMENT**

#### **1. Effect of Consent**

§ 8:55 Functions as an Article III judge

#### **2. Procedures to Consent**

§ 8:56 Express and implied consent

§ 8:57 Party's attorney may consent

§ 8:58 No right to withdraw consent

### **C. CHALLENGING ORDERS INVOLVING NON- DISPOSITIVE MATTERS**

§ 8:59 Right to review

§ 8:60 Format

§ 8:61 Transcript of proceeding before the magistrate judge

§ 8:62 Time to seek district court review; response

§ 8:63 Standards of review

§ 8:64 Additional evidence prohibited

§ 8:65 No entitlement to oral argument or a hearing

§ 8:66 Consequences of failing to timely seek district court  
review

### **D. CHALLENGING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS INVOLVING DISPOSITIVE MATTERS**

§ 8:67 Right to review

§ 8:68 Format

§ 8:69 Transcript of proceeding before the magistrate judge

§ 8:70 Time to object; response to objections

§ 8:71 Standard of review

§ 8:72 The consideration of new evidence

§ 8:73 New arguments raised for the first time in objections  
to the district court for de novo review

§ 8:74 No entitlement to oral argument or a hearing

§ 8:75 Consequences of failing to timely object: District court  
review

§ 8:76 Consequences of failing to timely object: Court of  
appeals review

## **XVI. SUPPLEMENTAL PLEADINGS—NEW AUTHORITY**

§ 8:77 Duty of litigants

## **XVII. BAIL DURING PENDENCY OF FEDERAL HABEAS PROCEEDING**

§ 8:78 Federal court's inherent authority

## **XVIII. CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS**

§ 8:79 Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

§ 8:80 Specific rights afforded

§ 8:81 Enforcement of rights

## **CHAPTER 9A. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES: STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS**

### **I. THE RULE AND ITS APPLICATION**

§ 9A:1 The rule

§ 9A:2 State and federal prisoners

§ 9A:3 Effective date

§ 9A:4 Mischaracterizing basis for relief

§ 9A:5 Longer state limitations period immaterial

§ 9A:6 Interpretation

§ 9A:7 Threshold issue

§ 9A:8 Whether the statute of limitations applies to each claim individually as opposed to the application as a whole

§ 9A:9 Constitutionality

§ 9A:10 Effect of untimely petitions

### **II. COMMENCEMENT OF THE LIMITATIONS PERIOD (THE CLOCK STARTS)**

#### **A. ONE-YEAR PERIOD**

§ 9A:11 Triggering dates

#### **B. FINALITY OF JUDGMENT**

§ 9A:12 Commencement date

##### **1. Four Common Scenarios**

§ 9A:13 No direct appeal taken

§ 9A:14 Appeal taken to first appellate level, but no discretionary appeal taken

§ 9A:15 Both first level and discretionary appeal taken, but no petition for certiorari filed

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 9A:16 Both first level and discretionary appeal taken, and petition for certiorari filed
- 2. Notification of Court Disposition
- § 9A:17 Actual notice not required
- 3. Other Actions That May Affect the Date of Finality
- § 9A:18 Appellate remand and resentencing; new, corrected, or intervening judgments; restitution orders
- § 9A:19 Delayed appeal
- § 9A:20 Finality of deferred adjudications
- § 9A:21 Finality prior to effective date of AEDPA

## C. STATE IMPEDIMENT

- § 9A:22 Generally
- § 9A:23 Violation of constitution or laws of the United States
- § 9A:24 “State action” requirement
- § 9A:25 Nexus requirement
- § 9A:26 Fact-dependent inquiry
- § 9A:27 Due diligence

## D. NEWLY-RECOGNIZED, RETROACTIVE RIGHTS

- § 9A:28 Generally
- § 9A:29 A new rule recognized by the Supreme Court
- § 9A:30 Made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review
- § 9A:31 When the limitations period commences for newly recognized rights

## E. DISCOVERY OF FACTUAL PREDICATE

- § 9A:32 Generally
- § 9A:33 “Due diligence”
- § 9A:34 Knowledge of facts, not their legal significance, controlling
- § 9A:35 —Ineffective assistance of counsel
- § 9A:36 —Change in controlling law
- § 9A:37 Evidence unnecessary
- § 9A:38 Vacating of prior conviction used to enhance present sentence or other court order a petitioner generates
- § 9A:39 Allowance of time for delivery when petitioner discovers factual predicate in a letter

### III. TOLLING

#### A. STATUTORY TOLLING FOR STATE PRISONERS

##### 1. Burden and General Principles

- § 9A:40 The rule
- § 9A:41 Burden
- § 9A:42 General tolling principles—Minimum application requirements
- § 9A:43 —Tolling stops, not restarts, the clock
- § 9A:44 —Second or successive petitions can toll
- § 9A:45 —Tolling principles generally inapplicable where state collateral review petition filed and denied before AEDPA’s effective date or after federal habeas petition deadline has lapsed

##### 2. Tolling Limited to “Properly-Filed” State Court Applications

- § 9A:46 Generally
- § 9A:47 Imposition of procedural bar does not necessarily mean that an application was not “properly filed”
- § 9A:48 Independence or adequacy of the state procedural bar immaterial
- § 9A:49 Application of the *Ylst* look-through doctrine
- § 9A:50 Untimely state petitions—Express untimeliness ruling
- § 9A:51 —No express untimeliness ruling
- § 9A:52 —Multiple procedural bars imposed, including untimeliness
- § 9A:53 Petition filed in the wrong state court
- § 9A:54 Second and successive petitions

##### 3. Tolling While the State Postconviction Application is “Pending”

- § 9A:55 Generally
- § 9A:56 Tolling for the period between state collateral review actions where the petitioner timely sought appellate review
- § 9A:57 Where petitioner does not appeal a lower court’s denial of postconviction relief
- § 9A:58 No tolling between state court petitions if there is unreasonable delay
- § 9A:59 —States with explicit timeliness periods
- § 9A:60 —States without explicit timeliness periods
- § 9A:61 No tolling where petitioner not moving to next higher appellate level

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 9A:62	No tolling for period between two petitions filed in the same court or lower level court where new claims added
§ 9A:63	No tolling between finality and state collateral review
§ 9A:64	No tolling between state court review and commencement of federal habeas action
§ 9A:65	No tolling during pendency of federal habeas action
§ 9A:66	Availability of tolling in seeking certiorari to the supreme court following state collateral review
§ 9A:67	Tolling of exhausted claims while pursuing state collateral review of unexhausted claims
§ 9A:68	Effect of overlapping petitions
§ 9A:69	No tolling between improperly filed state petitions
§ 9A:70	Tolling ends upon completion of the state collateral review process
§ 9A:71	Out-of-time appeals on collateral review
4. State post-conviction or other collateral review	
§ 9A:72	Pertinent judgment or claim
§ 9A:73	Claims in state petition not alleged in federal petition
§ 9A:74	Collateral review
§ 9A:75	Civil rights actions
§ 9A:76	Limited to judicial proceedings
B. STATUTORY TOLLING FOR FEDERAL PRISONERS	
§ 9A:77	Generally
§ 9A:78	Impediment to filing
§ 9A:79	Application to file second or successive motion to vacate
C. EQUITABLE TOLLING FOR STATE AND FEDERAL PRISONERS	
1. Whether Equitable Tolling is Precluded Under AEDPA	
§ 9A:80	Early Supreme Court decisions
§ 9A:81	Early court of appeals decisions
§ 9A:82	The Supreme Court rules— <i>Holland v. Florida</i>
2. Other Procedural Matters	
§ 9A:83	The equitable tolling standard generally
§ 9A:84	Burden

- § 9A:85 Waiver
- § 9A:86 Diligence
- § 9A:87 Nexus required even if extraordinary circumstances shown
- § 9A:88 Fact-dependent inquiry
- § 9A:89 Appellate review

### 3. Specific Circumstances Where Equitable Tolling is Not Warranted

- § 9A:90 Ordinary negligence or incapacity of counsel
- § 9A:91 Assistance by fellow inmates (“jailhouse lawyers”)
- § 9A:92 Lack of counsel
- § 9A:93 Pendency of unexhausted federal petition
- § 9A:94 Near miss
- § 9A:95 Ignorance of the law; lack of knowledge and expertise
- § 9A:96 Language difficulties
- § 9A:97 Conditions unique to prison confinement
- § 9A:98 Transcripts
- § 9A:99 Severity of sentence
- § 9A:100 Change in controlling state law
- § 9A:101 Ambiguity of tolling principles unrelated to untimely filing

### 4. Specific Circumstances Where Equitable Tolling is Warranted

- § 9A:102 Withdraw of counsel
- § 9A:103 Deception, bad faith, divided loyalty by counsel
- § 9A:104 Abandonment by counsel/egregious misconduct
- § 9A:105 Abandonment by counsel—Counsel fails to file a timely appeal or petition for post-conviction relief
- § 9A:106 —Habeas counsel fails to provide petitioner with his legal file
- § 9A:107 Mental incompetency and physical disabilities
- § 9A:108 Misconduct or delay by government officials
- § 9A:109 Lack of relevant materials in prison library
- § 9A:110 Confiscation or lack of access to legal materials
- § 9A:111 Petitioner misled by court
- § 9A:112 Delay in receiving court disposition
- § 9A:113 Delayed receipt of petition (or other document) by the court
- § 9A:114 Counsel’s failure to notify petitioner of a court ruling
- § 9A:115 District court error resulting in an untimely petition



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 9A:116    Uncertainty or change in law concerning calculation  
                  of the limitations period

§ 9A:117    Prospective tolling

### 5. Merits of Underlying Claims

§ 9A:118    Not relevant consideration

## IV. END OF THE STATUTE

§ 9A:119    Only application seeking merits adjudication stops  
                  the clock

§ 9A:120    Extensions of time to file 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254  
                  petitions or § 2255 motions to vacate

§ 9A:121    Lodging versus filing

§ 9A:122    Absence of filing fee or IFP application

§ 9A:123    Petition filed in wrong federal court

§ 9A:124    Non-compliance with filing requirements

§ 9A:125    The mailbox rule

§ 9A:126    Protective petitions

## V. CALCULATIONS

### A. FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 6(a)

§ 9A:127    Generally

§ 9A:128    Calculating the first day of the period

§ 9A:129    Calculating the last day of the period

§ 9A:130    Leap years

### B. THE MAILBOX RULE

§ 9A:131    Generally

§ 9A:132    Requirements where prison has legal mail system

§ 9A:133    Where prison has a legal mail system

§ 9A:134    Declaration/notarization requirement—Where  
                  prison does not have a legal mail system

§ 9A:135    —Enforcement of the declaration/notarization  
                  requirement

§ 9A:136    —Point in time that the declaration or notarization  
                  statement be filed

§ 9A:137    —Consequence of inmate's failure to submit a  
                  declaration or notarized statement

§ 9A:138    Mailbox rule not limited to pro se inmates

§ 9A:139    Burdens

§ 9A:140    State filings

§ 9A:141    Failure to use proper address

§ 9A:142    Filing must be delivered to prison officials for filing  
                  with the court

§ 9A:143 Petition never filed by the court

**C. FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 6(d)  
AND COMPARABLE STATE SERVICE-BY-MAIL  
RULES**

§ 9A:144 No extension of deadline

**VI. ACTUAL INNOCENCE EXCEPTION**

§ 9A:145 Initial confusion

§ 9A:146 Actual innocence exception established

**VII. RELATION BACK PRINCIPLES**

**A. THE RULE**

§ 9A:147 Claim arose out of the same conduct, transaction, or  
occurrence

**B. APPLICATION OF THE RULE**

**1. Relation Back Recognized**

§ 9A:148 A common core of operative facts

§ 9A:149 Amended claim merely adds more specific facts

§ 9A:150 Amended claim a more carefully drafted version of  
claim in original petition

§ 9A:151 Prior judgment set aside

§ 9A:152 Jurisdictional interest retained

**2. Relation Back Not Recognized**

§ 9A:153 Federal habeas action previously dismissed

§ 9A:154 Newly-exhausted claims in previously dismissed  
petition

§ 9A:155 Different types of ineffectiveness alleged

§ 9A:156 Amended claim different in nature from claims in  
original petition

§ 9A:157 Petition not dismissed, but stayed

**C. APPELLATE REVIEW**

§ 9A:158 *De novo* or abuse of discretion?

**VIII. PROCEDURES FOR RAISING DEFENSE**

**A. WAIVER OR FORFEITURE**

§ 9A:159 Generally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**B. MANNER OF ASSERTING DEFENSE**

- § 9A:160 Motion to dismiss
- § 9A:161 Answer
- § 9A:162 Sua sponte
- § 9A:163 Appellate court review

**IX. LACHES**

- § 9A:164 The rule
- § 9A:165 Requisite showing

# **Table of Contents**

## **CHAPTER 9B. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES: PROCEDURAL DEFAULT**

### **I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

- § 9B:1 The rule
- § 9B:2 Purpose
- § 9B:3 Effect of AEDPA generally
- § 9B:4 Not jurisdictional
- § 9B:5 Procedural default a preliminary issue
- § 9B:6 Application of procedural default principles—State prisoners in Section 2254 Cases
- § 9B:7 —Federal prisoners in Section 2255 Cases
- § 9B:8 —Federal prisoners challenging disciplinary proceedings in Section 2241 Cases
- § 9B:9 Treaty violation claims subject to procedural default principles
- § 9B:10 Procedural default principles apply equally in capital and non-capital cases
- § 9B:11 Procedural bars imposed after claim was properly exhausted do not bar federal review

### **II. THE PETITIONER VIOLATED A STATE PROCEDURAL RULE**

- § 9B:12 Generally

### **III. PROCEDURAL DEFAULT IMPOSED**

#### **A. NATURE OF THE DEFAULT**

- § 9B:13 Two manners of procedural default

#### **B. INVOCATION OF THE PROCEDURAL BAR BY THE STATE COURT**

- § 9B:14 The “plain statement” rule
- § 9B:15 —“Either/or” state court decisions
- § 9B:16 —Alternative merits grounds
- § 9B:17 —Plain statement rule not applicable to unexhausted, yet procedurally barred claims
- § 9B:18 Unexplained state court decisions and the look-through doctrine

- § 9B:19 The potential for ambiguity caused by multiple claims and multiple procedural bars
- § 9B:20 Unexplained or summary orders
- § 9B:21 The last reasoned state court decision must not have removed the procedural bar

**C. STATE’S APPLICATION OF PROCEDURAL BAR  
GENERALLY NOT SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY  
THE FEDERAL COURT**

- § 9B:22 Rule and exception

**IV. STATE PROCEDURAL RULE INDEPENDENT  
OF FEDERAL LAW**

- § 9B:23 Federal question
- § 9B:24 State court decision must not be interwoven with federal law
- § 9B:25 Independence determined as of the date the default was imposed
- § 9B:26 Effect of “plain error” or “fundamental error” state court review
- § 9B:27 Mandatory state review in capital cases

**V. THE STATE PROCEDURAL RULE IS ADEQUATE**

- § 9B:28 Question of federal law

**A. THE RULE IS CLEAR**

- § 9B:29 Petitioner on notice

**B. THE RULE IS FIRMLY ESTABLISHED**

- § 9B:30 Unannounced rules at time of default not firmly established

**C. THE RULE IS REGULARLY APPLIED**

- § 9B:31 Generally
- § 9B:32 Vast majority of cases
- § 9B:33 Manipulative intent unnecessary to finding irregularity
- § 9B:34 Adequacy limited to particular bar at issue
- § 9B:35 Discretion not necessarily problematic
- § 9B:36 Application of an established exception
- § 9B:37 No re-litigation of regularity once decided
- § 9B:38 Adequacy generally determined as of the date of default

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 9B:39 Consistency determination limited to cases where state actually advanced the procedural bar
- § 9B:40 Consistency determination limited to period preceding the date default occurred
- § 9B:41 Is the consistency determination limited to the face of the state court orders?
- § 9B:42 Clarification of existing rule does not establish inconsistent application
- § 9B:43 Unpublished state court decision

### D. OTHER LIMITATIONS IMPOSED BY THE ADEQUACY DOCTRINE

- § 9B:44 Exorbitant application of a generally sound rule
- § 9B:45 State procedural rules that unduly burden the assertion of federal rights
- § 9B:46 State procedural rule is unconstitutional
- § 9B:47 Ineffective state court waiver of collateral review
- § 9B:48 Mental competency claims
- § 9B:49 Rule requiring ineffective assistance claims be raised on direct appeal

## VI. AVOIDANCE OF A PROCEDURAL DEFAULT

- § 9B:50 Cause and prejudice or miscarriage of justice

### A. CAUSE

- § 9B:51 Objective factor external to the defense
  - 1. Interference by Government Officials That Makes Compliance with the Procedural Rule Impractical
    - § 9B:52 Generally
    - § 9B:53 Concealment or suppression of evidence
    - § 9B:54 Transcripts and records
    - § 9B:55 Action or inaction by prison officials
    - § 9B:56 Conditions associated with incarceration; lack of access to the courts
    - § 9B:57 Errors by courts or staff
    - § 9B:58 Coercion by government officials
    - § 9B:59 Reliance on erroneous precedent
  - 2. Basis of Claim was Unavailable
    - § 9B:60 The legal basis of the claim was not reasonably available

§ 9B:61 The factual basis of the claim was not reasonably available

**3. Ineffective assistance of counsel and abandonment of client**

§ 9B:62 Default occurred at a stage of the state court proceeding at which petitioner, although represented by counsel, had no constitutional right to counsel

§ 9B:63 Default occurred at a stage of the state court proceeding at which petitioner was constitutionally entitled to counsel

§ 9B:64 Counsel's error must rise to the level of a Sixth Amendment violation

§ 9B:65 Cause where same attorney represented petitioner at trial and on appeal or collateral review

§ 9B:66 Exhaustion of ineffectiveness claim constituting the basis for "cause"

§ 9B:67 Conclusory allegations insufficient

§ 9B:68 The procedural default was the result of counsel's conflict of interest

**4. Mental Illness of the Petitioner**

§ 9B:69 Generally not cause

**5. Miscellaneous Circumstances not Constituting Cause**

§ 9B:70 Specific grounds

**B. ACTUAL PREJUDICE**

§ 9B:71 Generally

§ 9B:72 Brady suppression of evidence claims

§ 9B:73 Where counsel's ineffectiveness constitutes the "cause" for the default

§ 9B:74 Claims involving structural error

**C. MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE**

**1. Actually Innocent of the Death Penalty Sentence**

§ 9B:75 Applicability

§ 9B:76 The standard

§ 9B:77 Extension to sentencing in noncapital cases

**2. Actually Innocent of the Offense of Conviction**

§ 9B:78 Applicability

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 9B:79 The gateway standard
- § 9B:80 Lesser degree of guilt
- § 9B:81 Newly discovered evidence requirement
- § 9B:82 Due diligence
- § 9B:83 Not an independent substantive claim
- § 9B:84 Guilty plea context
- § 9B:85 Effect of AEDPA

### 3. Possible Anomalous Results

- § 9B:86 Tension between *Schlup* and *Sawyer* standards

## VII. WAIVER OF THE PROCEDURAL DEFAULT DEFENSE

### A. GOVERNMENT WAIVER

- § 9B:87 Forfeiture or waiver of the defense
- § 9B:88 Procedural default defense must generally be asserted in government's first responsive pleading
- § 9B:89 Argument that the government waived its procedural default defense may itself be waived
- § 9B:90 Judicial estoppel
- § 9B:91 Belated assertion of the defense
- § 9B:92 Section 2254(b)(3) inapplicable to a procedural default defense

### B. RAISING THE DEFENSE SUA SPONTE

- § 9B:93 Court's discretion
- § 9B:94 Factors that guide discretion
- § 9B:95 The procedural posture of the case and its relationship to sua sponte invocation of the defense
- § 9B:96 Discretion to raise defense sua sponte extends to Section 2255 proceedings

### C. SIGNIFICANCE OF AN UNEXHAUSTED CLAIM

- § 9B:97 State remedies unavailable
- § 9B:98 State remedies available when petition filed

## VIII. APPLICATION OF PROCEDURAL BARS IN FEDERAL COURT

- § 9B:99 Generally
- § 9B:100 Burden of asserting the defense—The state must affirmatively raise
- § 9B:101 —The federal court may raise defense *sua sponte*



- § 9B:102 Burden of placing defense at issue
- § 9B:103 Ultimate burden of demonstrating adequacy

## **IX. APPELLATE REVIEW**

- § 9B:104 Standard of review
- § 9B:105 No need for government to file cross-appeal to challenge adverse procedural default ruling

## **X. A CASE STUDY: APPLICATION OF DEFAULT RULES TO CALIFORNIA PROCEDURAL RULES**

### **A. COMMON STATE PROCEDURAL BARS**

#### **1. Direct Appeal**

- § 9B:106 Overview
- § 9B:107 Untimely petition for review—Rule 8.500(e)(1) of the California Rules of Court
- § 9B:108 Contemporaneous objection rule
- § 9B:109 Invited error

#### **2. Habeas Corpus**

- § 9B:110 Untimeliness
- § 9B:111 Claim should have been raised on appeal, but was not
- § 9B:112 Successive petitions
- § 9B:113 Claims that were raised on direct appeal to the California court of appeal, but not timely presented to the California Supreme Court
- § 9B:114 Claims in state habeas where no objection was made at trial

### **B. IDENTIFYING PROCEDURAL RULES BY CITATION**

- § 9B:115 Common bars identified

### **C. NOT ALL PROCEDURAL BARS ARE PROCEDURAL DEFAULTS**

- § 9B:116 Generally
- § 9B:117 Claim previously raised on appeal
- § 9B:118 Failure to allege the claim with requisite specificity

### **D. APPLICATION OF THE INDEPENDENT PRONG TO SPECIFIC PROCEDURAL BARS**

- § 9B:119 Untimely petition for review

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 9B:120 Contemporaneous objection rule
- § 9B:121 Timeliness—Defaults imposed before August 2, 1998—Not independent
- § 9B:122 Should have raised claim on direct appeal—Defaults imposed before August 2, 1998—Not independent
- § 9B:123 Successive petitions—Defaults imposed before August 2, 1998—Not independent

### E. APPLICATION OF THE ADEQUACY PRONG TO SPECIFIC PROCEDURAL BARS

- § 9B:124 Untimely petition for review
- § 9B:125 Contemporaneous objection rule
- § 9B:126 Timeliness
- § 9B:127 Should have raised on direct appeal
- § 9B:128 Successive petitions

### F. FAILURE TO EXHAUST

- § 9B:129 Exhaustion requirement satisfied, but claim barred

## **CHAPTER 9C. AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES: EXHAUSTION**

### **I. THE RULE**

#### A. STATE PRISONERS

- § 9C:1 Section 2254 petitions
- § 9C:2 Section 2241 petitions

#### B. FEDERAL PRISONERS

- § 9C:3 Overview

### **II. GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

#### A. IN GENERAL

- § 9C:4 The purpose of the exhaustion rule
- § 9C:5 Claim-by-claim approach required
- § 9C:6 Threshold issue
- § 9C:7 *Sua Sponte*

#### B. INTERVENING CHANGE IN THE LAW

- § 9C:8 Intervening change in federal court's interpretation of federal law

- § 9C:9 Intervening change in federal law
- § 9C:10 Intervening change in state court's interpretation of state substantive law and newly established state procedures
- § 9C:11 Intervening change in state court's interpretation of state procedural law
- § 9C:12 Intervening change in state law which constitutes the grounds for the federal claim

**C. WHEN EXHAUSTION IS DETERMINED**

- § 9C:13 Overview

**D. NO "CLEAR CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION" EXCEPTION**

- § 9C:14 Overview

**E. NEW CLAIMS ON APPEAL**

- § 9C:15 Overview

**III. WHICH COURTS ARE PART OF THE EXHAUSTION PROCESS**

- § 9C:16 Lower state courts
- § 9C:17 Highest state court
- § 9C:18 United States Supreme Court
- § 9C:19 Multiple presentation is not required

**IV. PROPER PRESENTATION**

**A. CLAIM PRESENTED IN PROCEDURAL CONTEXT WHERE MERITS CONSIDERED IN EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES ONLY**

- § 9C:20 Overview
- § 9C:21 Motions to recall the mandate
- § 9C:22 Writs of prohibition

**B. FAIR PRESENTATION TO ALL APPROPRIATE STATE COURTS REQUIRED**

- § 9C:23 Overview

**C. INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL CLAIMS RAISED ON DIRECT APPEAL**

- § 9C:24 Overview

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **V. SIGNIFICANCE OF STATE COURT'S DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL CLAIM**

- § 9C:25 State court decided claim on its merits
- § 9C:26 State court denied the claim as procedurally barred
- § 9C:27 State intermediate court of appeal denied claim as procedurally deficient
- § 9C:28 State's highest court denied claim as procedurally deficient
- § 9C:29 State court failed to decide properly presented claim
- § 9C:30 State court ruled on claim, even though not adequately pled or otherwise properly presented
- § 9C:31 Mandatory review and automatic appeal statutes

### **VI. DEGREE OF SPECIFICITY NEEDED TO EXHAUST**

#### **A. FACTUAL PREDICATES**

- § 9C:32 Operative facts alleged
- § 9C:33 Presentation of new or additional facts

#### **B. LEGAL BASIS FOR CLAIM**

- § 9C:34 Overview
- § 9C:35 General approaches to defining the "fair presentation" requirement
- § 9C:36 Citation to state cases
- § 9C:37 The "four corners" rule
- § 9C:38 General appeals to broad constitutional principles
- § 9C:39 Exhaustion requires more than drive-by citation
- § 9C:40 Squarely presented
- § 9C:41 Where controlling state and federal law are essentially the same or identical
- § 9C:42 Citation of a relevant federal constitutional provision in relation to some other claim
- § 9C:43 Incorporation by reference
- § 9C:44 Relevance of *pro se* status
- § 9C:45 Demonstrated ability to state a federal claim
- § 9C:46 Illustrative court of appeals decisions

### **VII. PENDING STATE ACTION**

- § 9C:47 Overview
- § 9C:48 Exception: double jeopardy
- § 9C:49 Exception: excessive delay in the state court review process

§ 9C:50 Exception: bifurcation of conviction and sentence

## **VIII. ABSENCE OF STATE REMEDIES**

- § 9C:51 Overview
- § 9C:52 Absence of corrective process
- § 9C:53 Ineffective corrective process
- § 9C:54 —Unreasonable state court delay

## **IX. TYPES OF CLAIMS DISREGARDED FOR PURPOSES OF THE EXHAUSTION DETERMINATION**

- § 9C:55 State law claims
- § 9C:56 Noncognizable claims
- § 9C:57 Unintended claims
- § 9C:58 Absence of a colorable federal claim

## **X. THE PARTIES' BURDENS**

### **A. THE PETITIONER**

- § 9C:59 Overview

### **B. THE GOVERNMENT AND WAIVER**

- § 9C:60 Overview
- § 9C:61 Court not required to accept waiver
- § 9C:62 Effect of waiver—Possible loss of AEDPA deference
- § 9C:63 —Possible loss of procedural defaults

## **XI. THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE**

### **A. IN GENERAL**

- § 9C:64 Overview

### **B. MOTION TO DISMISS**

#### **1. All Claims Unexhausted**

- § 9C:65 Dismissal, stay, or merits decision
- § 9C:66 Existence of exhausted claims not alleged in the petition immaterial
- § 9C:67 Subsequent exhausted petition not second or successive

#### **2. Only Some Claims Exhausted**

- § 9C:68 Overview

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 9C:69 Required admonitions
- § 9C:70 Stay pending exhaustion
- § 9C:71 Dismissal of unexhausted claims
- § 9C:72 Vexatious litigation admonition

### C. ANSWER

- § 9C:73 Preserve exhaustion defense and seek dismissal on the merits
- § 9C:74 Waive exhaustion

## XII. STANDARDS OF REVIEW

- § 9C:75 Overview

## CHAPTER 10. THE RULE OF LAW

### I. LAW OF THE CASE DOCTRINE

- § 10:1 Overview

### II. STARE DECISIS

#### A. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

##### 1. Binding Effect

- § 10:2 Generally
- § 10:3 Dicta
- § 10:4 Plurality opinions
- § 10:5 Equally divided court
- § 10:6 Denial of petition for certiorari
- § 10:7 Alternative holdings

##### 2. Effect of Subsequent Supreme Court or Legislative Action

- § 10:8 Generally

#### B. LOWER FEDERAL COURT DECISIONS

##### 1. Court of Appeals Decisions

###### a. Same Circuit

- § 10:9 Published
- § 10:10 Unpublished
- § 10:11 Distinguishing precedential holdings from non-binding dicta—Generally
- § 10:12 —Alternative holdings

- § 10:13 Effect of petition for rehearing
- § 10:14 Effect of grant of petition for rehearing en banc
- § 10:15 Precedential weight of decisions reversed on other grounds
- § 10:16 Precedential weight of decisions vacated on other grounds
- § 10:17 Deference to circuit court interpretation of state law
- § 10:18 Effect of Supreme Court grant of certiorari

#### b. Other Circuits

- § 10:19 Generally
- 2. District Court Decisions
- § 10:20 Generally

### C. STATE COURT DECISIONS

#### 1. Interpreting Federal Law

- § 10:21 Generally

#### 2. Interpreting State Law

- § 10:22 Generally
- § 10:23 State supreme court decisions
- § 10:24 Intermediate state appellate court decisions
- § 10:25 Other sources
- § 10:26 Certification

## CHAPTER 11. SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE PETITIONS AND MOTIONS

### I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

#### A. IN GENERAL

- § 11:1 Overview
- § 11:2 Pre-AEDPA: abuse of the writ
- § 11:3 AEDPA: generally

#### B. DISTINGUISHING SUCCESSIVE PETITIONS: PRE- AND POST-AEDPA PERSPECTIVES

- § 11:4 Successive petitions filed pre-AEDPA
- § 11:5 Successive petitions filed post-AEDPA
- § 11:6 —Procedurally
- § 11:7 —Substantively

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**C. THE SECOND AND SUCCESSIVE  
RESTRICTIONS ARE JURISDICTIONAL**

§ 11:8 Overview

**D. SECTIONS 2244 AND 2255 DISTINGUISHED**

§ 11:9 Overview

**E. AEDPA SUPERSEDES RULE 9**

§ 11:10 Overview

**F. CONSTITUTIONALITY**

§ 11:11 Suspension clause—New-claim successive petitions

§ 11:12 —Same-claim successive petitions

§ 11:13 Separation of powers doctrine

§ 11:14 Article III grant of judicial power

§ 11:15 Supremacy clause

§ 11:16 Ex post facto

**G. AVAILABILITY OF § 2241 AS AN ALTERNATIVE  
TO § 2255 (FEDERAL PRISONERS)**

§ 11:17 Overview

§ 11:18 Savings clause

§ 11:19 Application of the Savings Clause in the context of  
second or successive motions

§ 11:20 District court procedures

§ 11:21 Application of AEDPA gatekeeping provisions to  
§ 2241 petitions

**II. SAME CLAIM PETITIONS**

§ 11:22 The rule

§ 11:23 Determining whether a claim was previously raised

§ 11:24 “Prior application” defined

**III. NEW CLAIM PETITIONS**

**A. THE RULE**

§ 11:25 Overview

§ 11:26 “Prior application” defined

**B. THE EXCEPTIONS**

**1. Newly Discovered Evidence**

§ 11:27 Overview



- § 11:28 Due diligence
- § 11:29 Constitutional error
- § 11:30 Innocence
- § 11:31 —Sentencing issues
- § 11:32 —Innocent of the death penalty
- § 11:33 “Previously” defined
- § 11:34 Remand for further factual development?

## 2. New Rule

- § 11:35 Overview
- § 11:36 Claim relies on a new rule of constitutional law
- § 11:37 Rules made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court
- § 11:38 Rules previously unavailable

# IV. DETERMINING WHETHER THE PETITION OR MOTION IS “SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE”

## A. IN GENERAL

- § 11:39 Overview
- § 11:40 The reference point for determining whether a petition is “second or successive”
- § 11:41 Whether prior action must have concluded
- § 11:42 Labels not determinative
- § 11:43 Petitions or motions that do not challenge the underlying conviction or sentence are not subject to the second or successive rule

## B. SEPARATE JUDGMENTS

- § 11:44 Generally
- § 11:45 Same judgment
- § 11:46 Not the same judgment—Different offenses or different trials
- § 11:47 —Intervening judgments

## C. TYPES OF ACTIONS THAT GENERALLY COUNT TOWARD THE SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE LIMITATION

- § 11:48 Initial petition adjudicated on the merits
- § 11:49 Initial petition dismissed as untimely
- § 11:50 Initial petition dismissed as procedurally defaulted
- § 11:51 Initial petition dismissed as uncognizable
- § 11:52 *Lackey* claims
- § 11:53 *Brady* claims

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### D. TYPES OF ACTIONS THAT GENERALLY DO NOT COUNT TOWARD THE SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE LIMITATION

- § 11:54 Initial petition dismissed for technical or procedural deficiencies
- § 11:55 Initial petition dismissed as unexhausted
- § 11:56 Initial petition dismissed for lack of jurisdiction
- § 11:57 Initial petition dismissed for failing to pay filing fee
- § 11:58 Initial petition voluntarily dismissed
- § 11:59 Initial petition erroneously dismissed
- § 11:60 Initial petition filed by counsel without petitioner's authorization
- § 11:61 Initial motion sought to reinstate right to appeal
- § 11:62 Motion to Recall the Mandate
- § 11:63 Rule 60(b) motions
- § 11:64 Motion for new trial (Rule 33 motions)
- § 11:65 Motion to correct or reduce sentence (Rule 35 motions)
- § 11:66 Motion to amend judgment (Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e))
- § 11:67 Opposition to state's petition for mandamus
- § 11:68 Section 2241 challenge
- § 11:69 Pre-judgment motion to amend
- § 11:70 Section 1983 civil rights action
- § 11:71 Motions for bail or similar relief
- § 11:72 Petitions challenging the administration of a sentence and related issues
- § 11:73 Motion to modify federal sentence
- § 11:74 Relief sought in the second petition or motion was not available at the conclusion of the first § 2254 or § 2255 proceeding

### E. RECHARACTERIZATION OF THE PETITION OR MOTION BY THE DISTRICT COURT

- § 11:75 Explained
- § 11:76 Required admonitions
- § 11:77 Effect of failure to give admonitions
- § 11:78 Admonitions not required if the court is recharacterizing a successive petition
- § 11:79 Retroactivity
- § 11:80 Application to § 2241 petitions

## V. PROCEDURAL ISSUES

### A. DISTRICT COURT

- § 11:81 Filing in district court without approval from court of appeals

- § 11:82 Filing in district court after approval by the court of appeals
- § 11:83 File in court of appeals where doubt exists

## B. COURT OF APPEALS

- § 11:84 Filing requirement
- § 11:85 Prima facie showing required
- § 11:86 No filing fee
- § 11:87 Three-judge panel
- § 11:88 30-day time limit
- § 11:89 No appeal or rehearing allowed

## C. SUPREME COURT

- § 11:90 Overview

# CHAPTER 12. POST-JUDGMENT PROCEEDINGS AND APPEALS

## I. MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

- § 12:1 Circumstances warranting reconsideration

## II. RULE 52(b) AND 59 MOTIONS

- § 12:2 Overview
- § 12:3 Rule 52(b) motion to amend findings
- § 12:4 Rule 59(a) new trial motions
- § 12:5 Rule 59(e) motion to amend or alter judgment

## III. RULE 60 MOTIONS

### A. GROUNDS

- § 12:6 Overview
- § 12:7 Clerical mistakes: Rule 60(a)
- § 12:8 Mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect: Rule 60(b)(1)—Mistakes
- § 12:9 —Excusable neglect
- § 12:10 Newly discovered evidence: Rule 60(b)(2)
- § 12:11 Fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct: Rule 60(b)(3)
- § 12:12 Void judgments: Rule 60(b)(4)
- § 12:13 Judgment satisfied, released, or discharged; prior judgment vacated: Rule 60(b)(5)
- § 12:14 “Catchall”: Rule 60(b)(6)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 12:15 Independent Rule 60(b) actions

### B. PROCEDURES

§ 12:16 Time limits for filing motion

§ 12:17 Court's authority to grant Rule 60(b) relief *sua sponte*

§ 12:18 Effect of filing notice of appeal on Rule 60(b) motions

§ 12:19 Effect of Rule 60(b) motion on time to appeal

§ 12:20 Second and successive petition rule

§ 12:21 Certificate of appealability requirement

## IV. BAIL AND RELEASE

### A. DETENTION PENDING REVIEW OF DECISION NOT TO GRANT HABEAS RELIEF

§ 12:22 In general

### B. DETENTION PENDING REVIEW OF DECISION GRANTING HABEAS RELIEF

§ 12:23 Standard for granting release

§ 12:24 Motion for relief directed to the district court in the  
first instance

§ 12:25 Conditions imposed on release

§ 12:26 Conditional writs

§ 12:27 Notice of appeal does not operate as a stay

### C. POST-APPEAL DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION

§ 12:28 Overview

## V. APPEAL OF DISTRICT COURT'S ORDER

### A. IN GENERAL

§ 12:29 Overview

### B. APPEALABILITY OF ORDERS AND JUDGMENTS

§ 12:30 Final orders

§ 12:31 Appealable collateral orders

§ 12:32 Interlocutory appeals

§ 12:33 Certified Rule 54(b) orders

§ 12:34 Writ of mandamus

### C. THE NOTICE OF APPEAL

§ 12:35 Overview

§ 12:36 Notice of appeal does not operate as a stay

## D. TIMELINESS OF APPEAL

### 1. In General

- § 12:37 Timely filing of notice of appeal is jurisdictional
- § 12:38 Filing deadlines
- § 12:39 Filing requirement
- § 12:40 Appeal period triggered by “entry” of judgment or order

### 2. Calculating Time to Appeal

- § 12:41 Computation
- § 12:42 No extension for service of judgment by mail
- § 12:43 Notice mistakenly filed in the court of appeals

### 3. “Mailbox” Rule

- § 12:44 Overview
- § 12:45 Requirements where prison has legal mail system
- § 12:46 Declaration/notarization requirement—Where prison has a legal mail system
- § 12:47 —Where prison does not have a legal mail system
- § 12:48 Enforcement of the declaration/notarization requirement
- § 12:49 At what point in time must the declaration or notarized statement be filed
- § 12:50 Consequence of inmate’s failure to submit a declaration or notarized statement
- § 12:51 Mailbox rule not limited to *pro se* inmates
- § 12:52 Burdens
- § 12:53 Failure to use proper address
- § 12:54 Filing must be delivered to prison officials for filing with the court
- § 12:55 Petition never filed by the court

### 4. Extensions and reopening of the time period

- § 12:56 District court’s authority
- § 12:57 “Excusable neglect” or “good cause”
- § 12:58 Defective notice of entry
- § 12:59 “Unique circumstance” doctrine
- § 12:60 Premature filing of notice of appeal

### 5. Effect of Post-Judgment Motions on Appeal Time-Frame

- § 12:61 Overview

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### 6. Procedures

- § 12:62 Place of filing
- § 12:63 Filing fee
- § 12:64 *In forma pauperis*
- § 12:65 Consolidated and related cases

### E. CROSS-APPEALS

- § 12:66 Standing limitation
- § 12:67 When required
- § 12:68 Filing deadline
- § 12:69 Procedure

### F. CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

#### 1. In General

- § 12:70 The rule
- § 12:71 The effective date of certificate of appealability requirement
- § 12:72 Certificate of appealability requirement only applies to prisoners

#### 2. Types of Orders in Which a Certificate of Appealability Is Required

- § 12:73 Final orders
- § 12:74 Detention complained of arises out of process issued by a state court
- § 12:75 Sections 2241 and 2255 proceedings involving federal prisoners

#### 3. Certificate of Appealability Standard

- § 12:76 Substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right
- § 12:77 AEDPA deference incorporated into COA analysis
- § 12:78 Each claim individually must meet the “substantial showing” standard
- § 12:79 Nonconstitutional issues—Nonconstitutional, substantive claims
- § 12:80 —Nonconstitutional, procedural issues

#### 4. Procedure for Obtaining a COA

##### a. The District Court

- § 12:81 District judge and magistrate judge authority to rule on requests for a COA
- § 12:82 Prisoner should first seek COA in the district court

- § 12:83 Filing of notice of appeal imposes duty on district court to decide whether COA is warranted
- § 12:84 Authority of district courts to grant or deny COAs *sua sponte*

#### b. Court of Appeals

- § 12:85 Issuance of the COA
- § 12:86 Review of COAs issued by district courts
- § 12:87 Court of appeals authority to expand COAs
- § 12:88 Court of appeals must construe notice of appeal as a request for a COA if one is not filed
- § 12:89 Obligation of prisoner to seek expansion of COA where COA only granted on some issues
- § 12:90 Rehearing of court of appeals' decision denying COA

#### c. The Supreme Court

- § 12:91 Overview

### G. REHEARING/REHEARING EN BANC

#### 1. In General

- § 12:92 Generally
- 2. Procedures For Rehearing; Rehearing En Banc
- § 12:93 Time deadlines
- § 12:94 Format, filing, and service requirements
- § 12:95 Responses to petitions for rehearing
- § 12:96 Reply to answers
- § 12:97 Affect on issuance of the mandate

### H. THE MANDATE

- § 12:98 Issuance of the mandate
- § 12:99 Motion to stay the mandate
- § 12:100 Recall of the mandate—Motion made by a party
- § 12:101 —*Sua sponte* action by court of appeals

## VI. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT REVIEW

### A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

#### 1. In General

- § 12:102 Overview
- 2. Cases Subject to Review
- § 12:103 State court judgments

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 12:104 Decisions of the federal courts of appeals
- § 12:105 Supreme court original jurisdiction
- § 12:106 Certain types of injunctive relief
- § 12:107 Decisions of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico
- § 12:108 Decisions of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Armed Forces
- § 12:109 Criteria warranting certiorari
- § 12:110 Certiorari petition does not stay mandate

### B. TIMING

#### 1. Stays

- § 12:111 Stays of circuit court judgments or decrees by a Supreme Court Justice
- § 12:112 Entry of judgment
- § 12:113 Issuance of mandate not relevant
- § 12:114 Effect of petitions for rehearing in the court of appeals
- § 12:115 Calculations—Filing date
- § 12:116 —Mailbox rule
- § 12:117 —Computation of time
- § 12:118 Extensions of time

### C. SERVICE

- § 12:119 Manner of service
- § 12:120 Service requirements for state and federal governments—United States
- § 12:121 —State governments
- § 12:122 Proof of service

## CHAPTER 13. RELIEF AND REMEDIES

### I. BURDENS

- § 13:1 Burden generally
- § 13:2 Burden under AEDPA
- § 13:3 Harmless error
- § 13:4 Cumulative error

### II. HABEAS RELIEF GENERALLY

- § 13:5 Wide discretion in choosing a remedy
- § 13:6 Habeas remedies for state and federal prisoners
- § 13:7 Statutory remedies for federal prisoners under § 2255



### **III. TYPES OF REMEDIES AVAILABLE**

#### **A. RELEASE ORDERS**

§ 13:8 Generally

##### **1. Unconditional Release Order**

§ 13:9 Generally

§ 13:10 Unlawful prosecutions

§ 13:11 Failure to comply with a conditional release order

§ 13:12 Extraordinary circumstances

##### **2. Conditional Writ Of Habeas Corpus**

§ 13:13 Generally

§ 13:14 Scope of relief: complete versus partial

§ 13:15 Failure to comply within stated time

§ 13:16 Specific terms of the remedy

§ 13:17 Harsher penalty at retrial

§ 13:18 Double Jeopardy concerns

#### **B. SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE**

§ 13:19 Generally

#### **C. DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

§ 13:20 Generally

§ 13:21 Invalidating a future sentence

§ 13:22 Invalidating the first of two or more consecutive sentences

§ 13:23 Awarding sentencing credits

#### **D. EXPUNGEMENT**

§ 13:24 Generally

§ 13:25 Jurisdiction

§ 13:26 Executive records

§ 13:27 Grounds for expunction

§ 13:28 Nullification

§ 13:29 Difficulty of enforcement

### **IV. SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES AND ASSOCIATED REMEDIES**

#### **A. PRE-TRIAL PROCEEDINGS**

§ 13:30 Remedy limited to new pre-trial proceeding

§ 13:31 When a new trial is required

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### B. CONVICTIONS

- § 13:32 New trial
- § 13:33 Reclassification of offense

### C. SENTENCING

- § 13:34 New sentencing proceeding
- § 13:35 Reduction of sentence

### D. DIRECT APPEALS

- § 13:36 Remedy of new appeal
- § 13:37 Remedy of release

### E. DELAYS AT TRIAL, SENTENCING, OR APPEAL

- § 13:38 Trial delays
- § 13:39 Undue delay in sentencing or processing the state  
direct appeal

### F. PLEAS

#### 1. Breach of Plea Agreement by the Prosecutor

- § 13:40 Generally
- § 13:41 Specific performance
- § 13:42 Remand to a different judge
- § 13:43 Which court decides the appropriate remedy

#### 2. Ineffective Assistance of Counsel Involving Pleas

- § 13:44 Generally
- § 13:45 Ineffective assistance in recommending the defendant  
accept a plea offer
- § 13:46 Ineffective assistance that deprives the defendant of a  
plea offer
- § 13:47 Ineffective assistance in failing to act on defendant's  
request to withdraw a guilty plea

#### 3. Unintelligent or Involuntary Pleas

- § 13:48 Types of relief

### G. STATE PAROLE HEARINGS

- § 13:49 Generally

## V. APPELLATE REVIEW

- § 13:50 Final order

§ 13:51 Standards of review

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A. Habeas Corpus Statutes

Appendix B. Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the  
United States District Courts: 28 U.S.C.A.  
Foll. § 2254

Appendix C. Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings in the  
United States District Courts — 28 U.S.C.A.  
Foll. § 2255

**Table of Laws and Rules**

**Table of Cases**

**Index**