Rec'd October 3, 2019

S256509

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

In re PAUL JOHN DENHAM on Habeas Corpus.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied.

CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice

Appendix A

Rec'd May 20th, 2019 for Denham

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

COURT OF APPEAL – SECOND DIST.
FILED
May 20, 2019
DANIEL P. POTTER, Clerk
kdominguez Deputy Clerk

In re	B296377
PAUL DENHAM	(Super. Ct. No. NA031090)
on	(Richard Romero, Judge)
Habeas Corpus.	**ORDER**

THE COURT:

The court has read and considered the petition for writ of habeas corpus filed March 20, 2019. The petition is denied without prejudice to its renewal on or after June 20, 2019. (*People v. Seijas* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 291, 307.)

RUBIN, P.J. MOOR, J. KIM, J.

Appendix B

Recd Sept 10th 2019

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re	B298689
PAUL DENHAM	(Super. Ct. No. NA031090)
on	(Chet L. Taylor, Judge)
Habeas Corpus.	ORDER

THE COURT:

The court has read and considered the petition for writ of habeas corpus filed June 26, 2019. The petition, which seeks a ruling on the merits of petitioner's substantive claims, is denied without prejudice to its renewal after the superior court rules on his pending petition. (*People v. Seijas* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 291, 307.) In prior petitions, petitioner has challenged the superior court's repeated extensions of the time to rule on his petition for writ of habeas corpus, which has been pending since April 2018. Habeas petitions must be decided in an expeditious manner. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.551(a)(3)(A); see also *People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 482 ["The goal . . . of the procedures that govern habeas corpus is to provide a framework in which a court can discover the truth and do justice in timely fashion"].)

Appendix C
1 of 2

However, because the petition was reassigned to a different judicial officer on January 25, 2019 at petitioner's own request, the superior court's subsequent orders extending the time to rule on defendant's petition have been supported by "good cause." (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.551(h).) We express no opinion as to whether further extensions of the time to rule would be supportable.

RUBIN, P.J. MOOR, J. KIM, J.

Appendix C
2 of 2