

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bryson v. Madden

No. 3:22-cv-00556-JES-VET (S.D. Cal. Feb. 28, 2025) · No. 3:22-cv-00556-JES-VET · Decided February 28,
2025

OPINION

Bryson v. Madden

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 RONALD BRYSON, Case No.: 3:22-cv-00556-JES-VET 12 Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR

13 v. SUMMARY JUDGMENT

14 RAYMOND MADDEN, et al., [ECF No. 41] 15 Respondents. 16 17 18 19 Before the Court is
Petitioner Ronald Bryson’s (“Petitioner”) Motion for Petitioner- 20 Initiated Summary Judgment
of Habeas Corpus Relief Without Evidentiary Hearing 21 (“Motion for Summary Judgment”).
ECF No. 41. For the reasons detailed below, the Court 22 DENIES the Motion for Summary
Judgment. 23

I. BACKGROUND

24 On September 18, 2023, Petitioner filed an Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas 25 Corpus
under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (“Amended Petition”). ECF No. 23. Respondents Raymond 26 Madden
and Rob Bonta (“Respondents”) filed an Answer to the Amended Petition on May 27 17, 2024
 (“Answer”). ECF No. 37. Therein, Respondents request the Court deny the 28 1 Amended Petition
without conducting an evidentiary hearing. Id. at 8. Petitioner filed a 2 Traverse to the Answer,
seeking an evidentiary hearing and release from custody. ECF No. 3 40. Petitioner concurrently
filed the Motion for Summary Judgment, wherein he 4 alternatively seeks immediate release
without an evidentiary hearing. ECF No. 41. 5 Petitioner attaches a 26-page memorandum of
points and authorities identical to the 6 memorandum attached to the Traverse. See ECF Nos. 40 at
5–30, 41 at 3–28.

7 II. DISCUSSION

8 A summary judgment motion is not the proper mechanism to address the relief 9 Petitioner
seeks. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure may be applied to a habeas 10 proceeding “to the
extent that they are not inconsistent with any statutory provisions or 11 these rules.” Rule 12,
Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. “Federal Rule of Civil
12 Procedure 56, which requires a court to draw all factual inferences in the nonmovant’s

13 favor . . . is apparently inconsistent and incompatible with 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1), which 14
states that ‘a determination of factual issue made by a State court shall be presumed to be 15
correct.’” Atkins v. Montgomery, No. 2:18-cv-06877-DOC-MAA, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16
233137, at *2 (C.D. Cal. June 25, 2019). “A court cannot simultaneously assess all facts in 17 the
record in the light most favorable to the nonmovant and accept as true the state court’s 18 factual
findings based on that same record.” Id. For this reason, “[m]otions for summary 19 judgment are
inappropriate in federal habeas proceedings.” Mendoza v. Pollard, No. 20- 20 cv-0847-GPC
(RBB), 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118295, at *23 (S.D. Cal. June 24, 2021) 21 (quoting Atkins, 2019
U.S. Dist. LEXIS 233137, at *1) (denying summary judgment 22 motion in habeas corpus
proceeding, in part, because it is not an “appropriate vehicle”). 23 The Court will address the
merits of the Amended Petition, which lists 120 grounds 24 for relief within more than 2000 pages
of argument and exhibits, in due course. The Court 25 will not issue a decision regarding
Plaintiff’s custody through a procedure incompatible 26 with federal habeas proceedings. 27 28 l
Hl. CONCLUSION 2 For the reasons stated above, the Court DENIES Petitioner’s Motion for
Summary 3 || Judgment. 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. 5 Dated: February 28, 2025 = a en 4, 7
Honorable James E. Simmons Jr. g United States District Judge 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28