

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

ALBERT JOSEPH AMOS,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL A. DITTMAN,  
Warden, Redgranite Correctional Institution.

Respondent.

---

ORDER

11-cv-354-wmc

Albert Joseph Amos, an inmate at the Redgranite Correctional Institution, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He has paid the five dollar filing fee.

Petitioner is challenging his conviction after a jury trial in the Circuit Court for Dane County for first degree recklessly endangering safety and possession of a firearm by a felon, Case No. 2007-CF-421. Petitioner filed a motion for post conviction relief, alleging his trial counsel was ineffective. The trial court denied the motion on December 1, 2009. On December 21, 2010, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals affirmed petitioner's conviction and the denial of his post conviction motion. On April 12, 2011, the Wisconsin Supreme Court denied petitioner's petition for review..

Petitioner alleges that his trial counsel was ineffective because she failed to call a potentially crucial witness.. This allegation that his counsel was ineffective is sufficient to state a constitutional claim. It appears that petitioner has exhausted his state court remedies and has filed his petition within the one-year limitations period.

## ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. **Service of petition.** Pursuant to an informal service agreement between the Attorney General and the court, the Attorney General is being notified to seek service on respondent Michael A. Dittman.

2. **Answer deadline.** Within 30 days of the date of service of this order, respondent must file an answer to the petition, in compliance with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause, if any, why this writ should not issue.

3. **Motions to dismiss.** If the state contends that the petition is subject to dismissal on its face - - on grounds such as the statute of limitations, an unauthorized successive petition, lack of exhaustion or procedural default - - then it is authorized to file within 30 days of this order, a motion to dismiss, a supporting brief and any documents relevant to the motion. Petitioner shall have 20 days following service of any dismissal motion within which to file and serve his responsive brief and any supporting documents. The state shall have 10 days following service of the response within which to file a reply.

4. **Denial of motion to dismiss.** If the court denies such a motion to dismiss in whole or in part, then it will set deadlines for the state to file its answer and for the parties to brief the merits.

5. **Briefing on the merits.** If respondent does not file a motion to dismiss, then the parties shall adhere to the following briefing schedule regarding the merits of petitioner's claims:

- Petitioner shall file a brief in support of his petition within 30 days after respondent files its answer. With respect to claim adjudicated on the merits by the Wisconsin Court of Appeals, petitioner must show either that (1) the state appellate court contravened a controlling opinion of the United States Supreme Court;(2) the state appellate court applied a controlling opinion of the United

States Supreme Court in an unreasonable manner; or (3) the state appellate court's decision rested upon an unreasonable determination of the facts. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

- Respondent shall file a brief in opposition within 30 days after petitioner files his initial brief.
- Petitioner shall have 20 days after respondent files its brief in which to file a reply brief.

Entered this 16<sup>th</sup> day of June 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER  
Magistrate Judge