APPENDIX A

S281960

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

In re DONALD WASHINGTON, SR., on Habeas Corpus.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus is denied. (See *In re Robbins* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 770, 780 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are untimely]; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767-769 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are successive]; *In re Miller* (1941) 17 Cal.2d 734, 735 [courts will not entertain habeas corpus claims that are repetitive].)

GUERRERO

Chief Justice

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re	B329313
DONALD WASHINGTON	(Super. Ct. No. A609715)
on	(Henry J. Hall, Judge)
Habeas Corpus.	**ORDER**

Received July 26th 2023 WEDNESDAY

THE COURT:

The court has read and considered the petition for writ of habeas corpus filed June 6, 2023. The petition is denied. Petitioner is procedurally defaulted from raising the issues presented in unjustified, successive habeas corpus petitions, and from challenging the validity of his 1975 conviction and sentence due to his inadequately explained delay in seeking relief. (See *In re Friend* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 720, 730-731; *In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 771, 775, 783.)

RUBIN, P.J. BAKER, J. MOOR, J.

APPENDIX C

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT 111

In the Matter of: DONALD WASHINGTON, Petitioner.	)	LASC No. A-609715 **ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

The court has read and considered the latest petition that was filed on March 2, 2023. This latest petition appears to raise the same issues as the following previous petitions:

(1) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on May 23, 2013, and denied on June 3, 2013;

(2) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on June 28, 2013, and denied July 20, 2013;

(3) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on September 5, 2013, and denied September 6, 2013;

(4) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on November 7, 2013, and denied on November 19, 2013;

(5) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on November 20, 2013, and denied November 22, 2013;

(6) The second petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on November 20, 2013, and denied December 19, 2013;

(7) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on September 22, 2016, and denied October 3, 2016;

(8) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on October 3, 2016, and denied October 7, 2016;

(9) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on March 17, 2017, and denied March 22, 2017;

(10) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on November 12, 2021, and denied November 17, 2021; and,

(11) The petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on November 29, 2021, and denied that same day.

Additionally, from a review of court records, it appears that Petitioner has filed the following petitions for extraordinary relief that were reviewed by a judge prior to this court's being assigned to Department 111:

(1) An April 21, 2001, motion;

(2) A June 30, 2004, petition for writ of habeas corpus;

(3) A September 23, 2005, petition for writ of habeas corpus;

(4) A petition for writ of habeas corpus that was filed on February 22, 2007, and apparently denied on May 2, 2007; and,

(5) A request for judicial action that was filed on May 10, 2007.

Moreover, Petitioner appears to have filed no fewer than twenty-one petitions for extraordinary relief challenging his conviction in the Court of Appeal and at least one unsuccessful appeal from a trial court denial of a petition for writ of habeas corpus. It also appears that Petitioner prosecuted an appeal from his conviction that affirmed that conviction in full. (Second District No. B035984.) JULY 16th 1976 CASE NO 78297

The June 28, 2013, and subsequent petitions were denied *with prejudice* as being repetitive, meritless, and untimely. These repetitive petitions also constitute an abuse of the writ.

After having read and considered the current petition, both on its merits and pursuant to those earlier rulings, the instant petition is also denied *with prejudice*, as will all future similar petitions.

Dated this 21st day of March 2023.

HENRY J. HALL
Judge of the Superior Court