

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Stanley W. Mundy v. Teauna Miranda

Mundy v. Miranda · No. 2:25-cv-1182 AC P · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California recommends dismissing Stanley W. Mundy’s habeas corpus petition without prejudice under *Younger v. Harris*. It also recommends denying the petitioner’s motion for stay and abeyance as moot and directs that a district judge be randomly assigned to the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison Claire
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1182 AC P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and moved for a stay and abeyance. After issuing an order to show cause concerning abstention under <i>Younger v. Harris</i> , the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending dismissal without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The findings and recommendations were subject to review by an assigned district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); no separate merits standard of review was applied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the § 2254 petition should be dismissed without prejudice under the Younger abstention doctrine.
2. Whether the motion for a stay and abeyance should be dismissed as moot following the recommended dismissal of the habeas petition.

HOLDINGS

1. The magistrate judge recommended that the habeas petition be dismissed without prejudice under Younger v. Harris because the circumstances described in the prior order to show cause warranted abstention and petitioner failed to show cause otherwise.
2. The magistrate judge recommended dismissing the motion for a stay and abeyance as moot because dismissal of the habeas petition would eliminate the need for a stay.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“IT IS RECOMMENDED that petitioner’s application for a writ of habeas corpus be dismissed without prejudice, and the motion for stay and abeyance (ECF No. 7) be dismissed as moot” (at 1)

“Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner Stanley W. Mundy is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel. He filed a federal habeas petition challenging ongoing state proceedings and separately sought a stay and abeyance. After being ordered to show cause why the action should not be dismissed under Younger, petitioner neither responded nor sought voluntary dismissal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a § 2254 habeas petition and a motion for stay and abeyance. The court ordered petitioner to show cause why the action should not be dismissed under Younger v. Harris and advised that he could alternatively voluntarily dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i). Petitioner did not respond by the deadline or voluntarily dismiss. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal without prejudice and denial of the stay motion as moot, subject to review by an assigned district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971)
- Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 STANLEY W. MUNDY, No. 2:25-cv-1182 AC P 12 Petitioner, 13 v.
ORDER AND FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS 14 TEAUNA MIRANDA, 15 Respondent.
16 17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas 18
corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, paid the filing fee, and filed a motion for a stay and 19
abeyance.

ECF Nos. 6, 7. On October 9, 2025, the undersigned issued an order to show cause 20 why this
case should not be dismissed pursuant to *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971). ECF 21 No. 8.
Petitioner was given thirty days from the date of service of the order to show cause why 22 the
petition should not be dismissed. *Id.* at 9. Petitioner was warned that failure to show cause 23
would result in the recommendation for dismissal pursuant to *Younger* and that the motion for 24
stay and abeyance be denied as moot.

Id. Petitioner was also informed that he could alternatively 25 seek voluntary dismissal of his
petition pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i) 26 and seek to refile after the
statute of limitations clock has begun. *Id.* 27 The deadline to respond to the order to show cause
has passed and petitioner has not filed 28 a response or a motion to voluntarily dismiss his
petition.

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court should randomly 2 || assign
a United States District Judge to this action. 3 Furthermore, IT IS RECOMMENDED that
petitioner's application for a writ of habeas 4 | corpus be dismissed without prejudice, and the
motion for stay and abeyance (ECF No. 7) be 5 || dismissed as moot, for all the reasons set forth in
the Order at ECF No. 8 (incorporated here by 6 || reference).

7 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 8 ||
assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 9 ||
after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written 10 ||
objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned 11
|| "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Petitioner is advised that 12
| failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District 13 ||
Court's order.

Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). 14 | DATED: November 24, 2025 ~ 15 Chane
ALLISON CLAIRE 16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26
27 28