

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Parsons v. Arias

Parsons · No. 25-cv-03861-DMR (PR) · Decided July 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California issues an order to show cause in a state prisoner’s habeas corpus action under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The order directs service, sets deadlines for Respondent’s answer or motion to dismiss and any traverse or opposition, and addresses magistrate judge consent and the petitioner’s ongoing procedural responsibilities.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Donna M. Ryu
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	July 17, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-03861-DMR (PR)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court issued an order to show cause because the petition did not appear facially meritless.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Federal habeas corpus
- Post-conviction relief
- Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the petition should proceed beyond initial screening under the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.
- What procedural schedule and response should govern the respondent's response to the habeas petition.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“It does not appear from the face of the petition that it is without merit.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jason Thomas Parsons is a state prisoner who filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus against Roberto A. Arias, identified as the warden. The court determined from the face of the petition that it did not appear to be without merit. No merits-based factual findings were made.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a § 2254 habeas petition and paid the filing fee. The court directed the respondent to consent or decline magistrate-judge jurisdiction and to file either an answer or a procedural motion to dismiss, with corresponding response deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Martinez v. Johnson, 104 F.3d 769, 772 (5th Cir. 1997)