

LIST OF EXHIBITS

- A. RULING, 3/21/2012
- B. ORDER, 4/25/2013
- C. ORDER, 3/28,2017
- D. ORDER, 6/17/2019



SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR 1989-012631

03/21/2012

JUDGE DOUGLAS L. RAYES

CLERK OF THE COURT
H. O'Shaughnessy
Deputy

STATE OF ARIZONA

GINGER JARVIS

v.

JAMES LYNN STYERS (B)

JULIE S HALL

COURT ADMIN-CRIMINAL-PCR
VICTIM SERVICES DIV-CA-CCC
VICTIM WITNESS DIV-AG-CCC

RULING

The Court has considered the following notice, motion, and reply, and makes the following rulings.

Notice of Postconviction Relief

IT IS ORDERED dismissing this notice as precluded under Ariz.R.Crim.P. Rule 32.2(a)(2) and 32.2(a)(3).

On October 23 2008, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit vacated the federal district court's judgment denying Defendant's writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, and remanded to the federal district court with instructions to grant the writ with respect to Defendant's sentence unless the state of Arizona, within a reasonable period of time, either corrected the constitutional error in petitioner's death sentence or vacated the sentence and imposed a lesser sentence consistent with law. *Styers v. Schriro*, 547 F.3d 1026, 1036 (9th Cir. 2008). The error at issue was an alleged¹ failure by the Arizona Supreme Court to consider evidence of Defendant's post-traumatic stress disorder when determining *de novo* whether the

¹ It is the Arizona Supreme Court's position that there was no error in its original opinion on direct appeal. *State v. Styers*, 227 Ariz. 186, 189, 254 P.3d 1132, 1135 (2011).
Docket Code 167

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR 1989-012631

03/21/2012

trial court had assessed the correct punishment, in violation of *Clemons v. Mississippi*, 494 U.S. 738, 748-49 (1990) and *Smith v. Texas*, 543 U.S. 37, 44-45 (2004)(noting the Eighth Amendment's "low threshold" for constitutional relevance of mitigating evidence). *See also Tennard v. Dretke*, 542 U.S. 274, 287 (2004)(holding that a jury must be allowed to consider relevant mitigating evidence even when there is no nexus between that evidence and the crime). At the request of the State, the Arizona Supreme Court reconsidered its previous decision and, in an opinion styled "Independent Review of Capital Sentence," again affirmed Defendant's sentence of death. *State v. Styers*, 227 Ariz. 186, 254 P.3d 1132 (2011). Defendant's petition for writ of certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court on October 31, 2011. *Styers v. Arizona*, 132 S.Ct. 540 (2011). The Arizona Supreme Court issued its mandate on January 10, 2012. Mandate at 1. The Arizona Supreme Court did not, however, issue a notice of postconviction relief or appoint counsel for Defendant pursuant to Rule 32.4; Defendant filed notice himself and requested counsel.

Defendant now asserts that he is entitled to again petition this Court for postconviction relief of-right, because the Arizona Supreme Court's exercise of its jurisdiction to correct the alleged reweighing error constitutes a restarting of the direct appeal proceedings in this case.

This Court is not unmindful of Defendant's position, which is supported by the compelling dissent to the Arizona Supreme Court's en banc decision. *State v. Styers*, 227 Ariz. at 190-91, 254 P.3d at 1136-37 (Hurwitz, VCJ dissenting).

However, the majority characterized its independent review of petitioner's death sentence, "regardless of what one calls the type of review we now undertake," as something other than a restarting of direct review such as to entitle Defendant to relief under *Ring v. Arizona*, 536 U.S. 584 (2002). *State v. Styers*, 227 Ariz. at 187-88, 254 P.3d at 1133-34. The Court went out of its way to declare the direct appeal final back on October 14, 1994, when its mandate issued. *Id.* at 187, 1133. Clearly, the Court intended to limit its review to the narrow issue before it on the State's motion, and not to revive the direct appeal or any subsequent collateral proceeding, as evidenced by the Court's failure to issue a notice of postconviction relief or appoint counsel for Defendant.

Alternatively, any new, cognizable claims of ineffective assistance of counsel that Defendant may wish to raise, referenced in his Notice of Postconviction Relief at 3, are waived under Rule 32.2(a)(3) due to counsel's failure to raise them in any previous trial, appeal, or collateral proceeding. Defendant has not met his burden to explain how any

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR 1989-012631

03/21/2012

ineffective assistance of counsel claim he wants to raise is a potential exception to preclusion under Rule 32.2(b).

For all the foregoing reasons, this Court is constrained to follow the majority ruling of the Arizona Supreme Court, and to dismiss Defendant's notice as precluded under Rule 32.2(a)(2) and 32.2(a)(3).

Motion to Stay Postconviction Proceedings

IT IS ORDERED denying this motion as moot, given that there are no postconviction proceedings pending before this Court.

This case is eFiling eligible: <http://www.clerkofcourt.maricopa.gov/efiling/default.asp>. Attorneys are encouraged to review Supreme Court Administrative Order 2011-140 to determine their mandatory participation in eFiling through AZTurboCourt.

B

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

WO

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

James Lynn Styers,

Petitioner,

vs.

Charles L. Ryan, et al.,

Respondents.

No. CV-12-2332-PHX-JAT

DEATH PENALTY CASE

ORDER

Petitioner James Lynn Styers has filed a second federal habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, alleging that he is imprisoned and sentenced to death in violation of the United States Constitution. Respondents seek dismissal of the petition as successive. (Doc. 9.) For the reasons that follow, the Court determines that it lacks jurisdiction to consider several claims in the petition but that the remaining claims are not “second or successive” within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2).

BACKGROUND

In 1989, Petitioner murdered Christopher Milke, the four-year-old son of a woman with whom he shared an apartment. A jury convicted him of first degree murder, conspiracy to commit first degree murder, child abuse, and kidnapping, and the trial court sentenced him to death.

On direct appeal, the Arizona Supreme Court reversed Petitioner’s conviction for child abuse but affirmed the remaining convictions. *State v. Styers*, 177 Ariz. 104, 865 P.2d 765

1 (1993), *cert denied*, 513 U.S. 855 (1994) (“*Styers I*”). The state court also struck one of the
2 aggravating factors but nonetheless affirmed the death sentence after conducting an
3 independent review of the remaining sentencing factors.

4 Following unsuccessful state post-conviction-relief proceedings, Petitioner filed a
5 habeas petition in federal court. United States District Court Judge Earl H. Carroll denied
6 relief. On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit reversed, finding that the
7 Arizona Supreme Court had failed to properly reweigh the aggravating and mitigating
8 circumstances after striking an aggravating factor, as required by *Clemons v. Mississippi*, 494
9 U.S. 738, 748-49 (1990), and *Eddings v. Oklahoma*, 455 U.S. 104, 115 (1982). *Styers v.*
10 *Schriro*, 547 F.3d 1026, 1034-35 (9th Cir. 2008), *cert. denied*, 130 S. Ct. 379 (2009) (“*Styers*
11 *II*”). Pursuant to the Ninth Circuit’s mandate, the district court entered judgment granting
12 the writ of habeas corpus unless the State of Arizona, within 120 days of the judgment,
13 “initiates proceedings either to correct the constitutional error in Petitioner’s death sentence
14 or to vacate the sentence and impose a lesser sentence consistent with the law.” *Styers v.*
15 *Ryan*, No. 2:98-cv-2244, slip op. at 2 (D. Ariz. Nov. 25, 2009).

16 At the request of the State and over Petitioner’s objection, the Arizona Supreme Court
17 ordered briefing and argument and then conducted a new independent review of Petitioner’s
18 capital sentence, again finding that the proffered mitigation was not sufficiently substantial
19 to warrant leniency. See *State v. Styers*, 227 Ariz. 186, 254 P.3d 1132 (9th Cir.), *cert denied*,
20 132 S. Ct. 540 (2011) (“*Styers III*”). Subsequently, Petitioner moved this Court to grant an
21 unconditional writ releasing him from his capital sentence, arguing *inter alia* that the Arizona
22 Supreme Court erred by conducting a new independent review and not remanding for a new
23 sentencing hearing before a jury. The Court denied the motion but granted a certificate of
24 appealability on the question of whether Petitioner was entitled to a new sentencing hearing
25 in order to correct the *Clemons/Eddings* error. That appeal is pending. See *Styers v. Ryan*,
26 No. 2:98-cv-2244 (Jul. 26, 2012), *appeal docketed*, No. 12-16952 (9th Cir. Sept. 4, 2012).

27 On October 30, 2012, Petitioner filed the instant second petition, asserting eight grounds
28

1 for relief: (1) ineffective assistance of counsel at sentencing for failing to develop and
2 present mitigating evidence; (2) ineffective assistance of counsel for failing to investigate and
3 present evidence demonstrating lack of premeditation; (3) failure of the Arizona Supreme
4 Court to conduct a constitutionally adequate independent sentencing review; (4) ineffective
5 assistance of counsel on appeal for failing to challenge the “especially heinous, cruel, or
6 depraved” aggravating factor; (5) failure of the Arizona Supreme Court to remand for a jury
7 determination as to aggravating factors; (6) imposition of the death penalty after a lengthy
8 period of incarceration; (7) failure of the Arizona Supreme Court to remand for a new
9 mitigation hearing; and (8) failure of the state court to provide post-conviction counsel and
10 post-conviction review.¹ In their motion to dismiss, Respondents assert that Petitioner failed
11 to seek permission from the Ninth Circuit to file a second or successive petition and that this
12 Court lacks jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b).

13 **DISCUSSION**

14 **I. Second or Successive Petition**

15 The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) imposed
16 significant burdens on petitioners who try to raise new claims in “second or successive”
17 habeas petitions. *See Burton v. Stewart*, 549 U.S. 147, 152-53 (2007) (per curiam)
18 (observing that 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b), as amended by AEDPA, established a stringent set of
19 procedures a prisoner must follow before filing a second or successive federal habeas corpus
20 petition challenging the same conviction). First, a district court must dismiss any claim
21 presented in a second or successive habeas petition that was presented in a prior petition. 28
22 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1). Second, a new claim not raised in a prior petition also must be
23 dismissed unless (1) the claim rests on a new, retroactive rule of constitutional law or (2) the
24 factual basis of the claim was not previously discoverable through due diligence and these

25 _____
26 ¹ The petition identifies six primary claims (A-F) and at least two distinct sub-claims.
27 For administrative ease, the Court has identified and numbered each individual claim in the
28 order in which they are asserted in the petition.

1 new facts establish by clear and convincing evidence that no reasonable factfinder would
2 have found the applicant guilty of the underlying offense. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2). Even in
3 the latter circumstance, leave of the court of appeals is required before the successive petition
4 may be pursued in a district court. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A). These requirements are
5 jurisdictional and cannot be waived. *Burton*, 549 U.S. at 157; *Torres v. Senkowski*, 316 F.3d
6 147, 151 (2d Cir. 2003).

7 It is undisputed that the instant petition is a “second-in-time” petition, challenging the
8 same conviction on which Petitioner previously sought federal habeas relief. It is also
9 undisputed that Petitioner has neither sought nor obtained permission from the Ninth Circuit
10 for filing a second or successive petition. However, this does not end the inquiry.

11 The Supreme Court “has declined to interpret ‘second or successive’ as referring to all
12 § 2254 applications filed second or successively in time, even when the later filings address
13 a state-court judgment already challenged in a prior § 2254 application.” *Panetti v.*
14 *Quarterman*, 551 U.S. 930, 944 (2007). For example, in *Panetti*, the Court held that
15 competency-to-be-executed claims are exempt from AEDPA’s limitation on second or
16 successive petitions because such claims generally are not ripe until after the time has run
17 to file a first habeas petition. *Id.* at 947; *see also Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 478
18 (2000) (declining to apply § 2244(b) to a second petition where the first was dismissed for
19 lack of exhaustion).

20 In *Magwood v. Patterson*, the Court held that a second-in-time petition challenging a
21 judgment imposed after resentencing was not “second or successive” under § 2244(b)(2),
22 where the first petition was filed prior to resentencing and challenged the original judgment.
23 130 S. Ct. 2788, 2796 (2010). Thus, where there is a “new judgment intervening between
24 the two habeas petitions,” the latter petition challenging the new judgment is not second or
25 successive. *Id.* at 2802 (quoting *Burton*, 549 U.S. at 156). Because *Magwood* involved a
26 petitioner who obtained a conditional writ as to his sentence and whose subsequent petition
27 challenged only the resentencing proceeding, the Court declined to determine whether in the
28

1 same context a petitioner could challenge “not only his resulting, *new* sentence, but also his
2 original, *undisturbed* conviction.” *Id.*

3 Although Petitioner references *Magwood* in his petition (Doc. 1 at 74), he does not cite
4 it in his opposition to Respondents’ motion to dismiss. Nevertheless, Petitioner’s opposing
5 brief characterizes his death sentence as “new” (in light of the independent review
6 undertaken by the Arizona Supreme Court in response to the district court’s conditional writ)
7 and suggests that a second habeas petition challenging the “new death sentence” is not
8 successive. (Doc. 11 at 3.) Further, the petition asserts that Petitioner’s death sentence was
9 “vacated” by the conditional writ. (Doc. 1 at 52.) In making these assertions, Petitioner
10 misapprehends the nature of the relief provided during his first habeas proceeding.

11 The Ninth Circuit remanded Petitioner’s case to the district court for entry of a
12 conditional writ on the ground that the Arizona Supreme Court had failed to consider all of
13 Petitioner’s proffered mitigation evidence when it conducted its independent review of
14 Petitioner’s death sentence. *Styers II*, 547 F.3d at 1035. In doing so, the court “neither
15 express[ed] nor impl[ied] any opinion as to the appropriate sentence in this case. This is a
16 matter for the state courts, so long as the constitutional obligations under *Eddings* and
17 *Clemons* are honored.” *Id.* at 1036. Subsequently, the district court granted a conditional
18 writ, stating that a writ of habeas corpus (releasing Petitioner from his sentence) *would be*
19 granted “unless the State of Arizona, within 120 days from the entry of this Judgment,
20 initiates proceedings either to correct the constitutional error in Petitioner’s death sentence
21 or to vacate the sentence and impose a lesser sentence consistent with the law.” *Styers v.*
22 *Ryan*, No. 2:98-cv-2244, slip op. at 2 (D. Ariz. Nov. 25, 2009). The district court did not
23 order that Petitioner be released from his death sentence or direct that Petitioner receive a
24 new sentencing hearing.

25 In response to the conditional writ, the Arizona Supreme Court conducted a new
26 independent sentencing review and reaffirmed the trial court’s original capital sentence.
27 Consequently, although further state proceedings have been undertaken by the Arizona
28

1 Supreme Court in Petitioner's case, the judgment of conviction and sentence at issue in the
2 instant petition is the same judgment entered by the trial court on December 14, 1990, and
3 challenged by Petitioner in his first habeas petition. Because there is no intervening
4 judgment here, the Court finds *Magwood* inapposite. *Cf. Wentzell v. Neven*, 674 F.3d 1124,
5 1128 (9th Cir. 2012) (holding that second-in-time petition filed after entry of an amended
6 judgment is not "second or successive," even if challenging unaltered component of original
7 judgment, because "it challenges a new, intervening judgment"). However, this finding does
8 not preclude further consideration of whether any of Petitioner's claims may nonetheless be
9 brought in a second petition without the necessity of satisfying the gatekeeping requirements
10 of 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b).

11 The Ninth Circuit has acknowledged that the reasoning of *Panetti* is not limited to
12 competency-for-execution claims. In *United States v. Buenrostro*, the court observed that
13 "[p]risoners may file second-in-time petitions based on events that do not occur until a first
14 petition is concluded" if the claims raised therein "were not ripe for adjudication at the
15 conclusion of the prisoner's first federal habeas proceeding." 638 F.3d 720, 725 (9th Cir.
16 2011) (listing cases). In *United States v. Lopez*, the court held that the considerations
17 identified by the Supreme Court in deciding *Panetti* "must be considered in deciding whether
18 other types of claims that do not survive a literal reading of AEDPA's gatekeeping
19 requirements may nonetheless be addressed on the merits." 577 F.3d 1053, 1064 (9th Cir.
20 2009). These considerations are "(1) the implications for habeas practice of reading 'second
21 or successive' literally for such claims, (2) whether barring such claims would advance the
22 policies behind AEDPA's passage and (3) the Court's pre- and post-AEDPA habeas
23 jurisprudence, including the common law abuse-of-the-writ doctrine." *Id.* at 1056.

24 In light of the above principles, the Court will consider whether any of Petitioner's
25 claims are exempt from AEDPA's limitations on second or successive petitions. The inquiry
26 into whether a habeas application is second or successive may be made by examining the
27 specific claims presented in a later petition and comparing those claims to the claims
28

1 presented in an earlier petition. *See, e.g., Pace v. Diguglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 416 (2005)
2 (observing that the requirements of § 2244(b)(2) do not apply to a petition as a whole but
3 require inquiry into specific claims). As discussed below, the instant petition includes claims
4 that were either previously raised, ripe but not previously raised, or not ripe at the time he
5 filed his first habeas petition.

6 **A. Claim Previously Raised**

7 In his first habeas petition, Petitioner alleged that trial counsel performed ineffectively
8 by failing to investigate, develop, and present available mitigating evidence at sentencing.
9 Petitioner reasserts the same allegation as Claim 1 in his second-in-time petition. Pursuant
10 to the mandate of 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1), this claim must be dismissed. *See Gonzalez v.*
11 *Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 529-30 (2005); *West v. Ryan*, 652 F.3d 1048, 1053 (9th Cir. 2011).

12 **B. Ripe Claims Not Previously Raised**

13 Petitioner's second-in-time petition includes several claims that were ripe prior to the
14 filing of his first habeas petition: trial counsel ineffectiveness for failing to investigate and
15 present evidence demonstrating lack of premeditation (Claim 2); appellate counsel
16 ineffectiveness for failing to challenge the Arizona Supreme Court's application of the
17 "heinous, cruel, or depraved" aggravating factor in a motion for rehearing (Claim 4); and
18 cruel and unusual punishment from imposition of the death penalty after a lengthy period of
19 incarceration (Claim 6). At the time of his first habeas petition, Petitioner was aware of the
20 facts underlying each of these claims but did not include them in the petition. Therefore,
21 Claims 2, 4, and 6 are "second or successive" under § 2244(b)(2) and this Court lacks
22 jurisdiction to entertain them absent authorization from the court of appeals. *See Allen v.*
23 *Ornoski*, 435 F.3d 946, 958 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that second-in-time petition raising
24 Eighth Amendment claim based on lengthy incarceration prior to execution is "second or
25 successive"); *Cooper v. Calderon*, 274 F.3d 1270, 1273 (9th Cir. 2001) (holding that second-
26 in-time petition alleging ineffective assistance of counsel based on previously known factual
27 predicate is "second or successive").

28

1 **C. Unripe Claims Not Previously Raised**

2 The remainder of Petitioner's claims arise from events that transpired following
3 issuance of the conditional writ. Petitioner asserts that the Arizona Supreme Court
4 unconstitutionally conducted a second independent review of his sentence and during this
5 review impermissibly applied a causal-nexus requirement to his mitigation evidence (Claim
6 3); that the Arizona Supreme Court's failure to remand for a new sentencing hearing
7 following the conditional writ violated his right under the Sixth Amendment to a jury
8 determination of aggravating factors and his rights to due process, equal protection, and to
9 be free from cruel and unusual punishment (Claims 5 and 7); and that "his rights to habeas
10 corpus under Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution" and under the Fifth,
11 Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments were violated by the state court's summary dismissal
12 of his notice of intent to seek state post-conviction relief (Claim 8). (Doc. 1 at 79-80.)

13 None of these claims could have been raised in Petitioner's first habeas petition. The
14 factual predicate for these claims did not arise until after the Arizona Supreme Court
15 conducted a new independent sentencing review in response to the district court's issuance
16 of a conditional writ in the first habeas proceeding. Numerous circuit courts permit a
17 prisoner to file second petitions "relating to denial of parole, revocation of a suspended
18 sentence, and the like because such claims were not ripe for adjudication at the conclusion
19 of the prisoner's first federal habeas proceeding." *Buenrostro*, 638 F.3d 720, 725 (9th Cir.
20 2011) (citing cases); *see also Hill v. Alaska*, 297 F.3d 895, 898 (9th Cir. 2002) (declining to
21 find petition successive "if the prisoner did not have an opportunity to challenge the state's
22 conduct in a prior petition"); *Walker v. Roth*, 133 F.3d 454, 455 (7th Cir. 1997) (per curiam)
23 ("None of these new claims were raised in his first petition, nor could they have been; [the
24 petitioner] is attempting to challenge the constitutionality of a proceeding which obviously
25 occurred after he filed, and obtained relief, in his first habeas petition."). Because Claims
26 3, 5, 7, and 8 could not have been included in Petitioner's first petition, he "is not obliged to
27 secure [the Ninth Circuit's] permission prior to filing his habeas petition in the district court."
28

1 *Hill*, 297 F.3d at 899.

2 **II. Stay of Proceedings**

3 In his opposition to Respondents' motion to dismiss, Petitioner notes that the instant
4 petition will likely become moot if he prevails on appeal from this Court's order in his
5 original habeas proceeding denying his motion to grant an unconditional writ. *See Styers v.*
6 *Ryan*, No. 2:98-cv-2244 (D. Ariz. Jul. 26, 2012) (unpublished order). Indeed, the vast
7 majority of the issues remaining in the instant petition are identical to those raised by
8 Petitioner in his motion for entry of an unconditional writ releasing him from his capital
9 sentence.² As already noted, this Court granted a Certificate of Appealability on the issue
10 of whether Petitioner was entitled to a new sentencing proceeding before a jury and that
11 appeal remains pending. Thus, a decision by the Ninth Circuit likely will be dispositive of
12 this issue and may moot the entire petition. For this reason, the Court finds that the interests
13 of justice and judicial economy are best served by staying these proceedings pending a
14 decision by the Ninth Circuit.

15 Based on the foregoing,

16 **IT IS ORDERED** that Respondents' Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 9) is **GRANTED IN**
17 **PART** and **DENIED IN PART**.

18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Claim 1 of Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas
19 Corpus (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1).

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Claims 2, 4, and 6 of Petitioner's Petition for Writ
21 of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 1) are **DISMISSED** for lack of jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
22 § 2244(b)(3)(A).

23

24


25 ² Although similar issues were raised vis-a-vis Petitioner's post-judgment motion for
26 entry of an unconditional writ of habeas corpus in his first habeas proceeding, the Court's
27 inquiry there was whether the Arizona Supreme Court sufficiently remedied the
28 constitutional infirmity found in *Styers II*, not whether the state court's actions in curing the
Clemons/Eddings error resulted in a new violation of Petitioner's constitutional rights.

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this matter is stayed pending the issuance of a decision by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Styers v. Ryan*, No. 2:98-cv-2244 (Jul. 26, 2012), *appeal docketed*, No. 12-16952 (9th Cir. Sept. 4, 2012).

DATED this 24th day of April, 2013.



James A. Teilborg
Senior United States District Judge

C

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

James Lynn Styers,
Petitioner,
v.
Charles L Ryan,
Respondent.


No. CV-12-02332-PHX-JAT
ORDER

In an order dated April 25, 2013, the Court denied four of the claims in Styers' habeas petition and stayed the remaining claims pending issuance of a decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Styers v. Ryan*, 98-cv-2244-JAT. (Doc. 19.) The Court of Appeals having issued its mandate in that case, affirming this Court's denial of habeas relief after the Arizona Supreme Court's independent review of Styers' death sentence,

IT IS ORDERED lifting the stay in this matter (Doc. 19 at 10).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no later than April 28, 2017, Styers shall show cause why the stayed claims should not be denied as meritless based on the opinion of the Ninth Circuit in *Styers v. Ryan*, 811 F.3d 292 (9th Cir. 2015).

Dated this 28th day of March, 2017.


James A. Teilborg
Senior United States District Judge

D

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 27 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JAMES LYNN STYERS,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

CHARLES L. RYAN,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 17-17356

D.C. No. 2:12-cv-02332-JAT

District of Arizona, Phoenix

ORDER

Before: FARRIS, W. FLETCHER, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

This case is stayed pending a decision by the Supreme Court in *McKinney v. Arizona*, No. 18-1109. Appellate proceedings will remain in abeyance pending further order of the court.