

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEROY E. KENDALL, Petitioner, v. CYNTHIA TAMPKINS, Respondent.
--

Case No. 1:16-cv-00113 MJS (HC)

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO
DISMISS SUCCESSIVE PETITION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT
TO 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)**

**ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO ASSIGN DISTRICT COURT JUDGE TO
THE PRESENT MATTER**

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

In the petition filed on January 25, 2016, Petitioner challenges a July 12, 2010 conviction in the Superior Court of California, County of Kern for attempted murder with great bodily injury and other related charges and enhancements. Petitioner was sentenced to a determinate state prison term of thirteen (13) years.

A review of the Court's dockets and files shows Petitioner has previously sought habeas relief with respect to this conviction. In case number 1:13-cv-00209-LJO-JLT (HC), Petitioner challenged the same underlying conviction. On October 30, 2015, the petition was denied on the merits. See Kendall v. Tampkins, E.D. Cal. Case No. 1:13-cv-00209-LJO-JLT (HC), ECF Nos. 26, 30. Petitioner also filed a second habeas petition

1 with this court on November 10, 2015. That petition was dismissed as a second or
2 successive petition on December 28, 2015. See Kendall v. Tampkins, E.D. Cal. Case
3 No. 1:15-cv-01703-AWI-JLT (HC), ECF Nos. 5, 8.

4 **I. DISCUSSION**

5 A court must dismiss a second or successive petition that raises the same
6 grounds as a prior petition. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1). A court must also dismiss a second
7 or successive petition raising a new ground unless the petitioner can show that 1) the
8 claim rests on a new constitutional right, made retroactive by the United States Supreme
9 Court or 2) the factual basis of the claim was not previously discoverable through due
10 diligence, and these new facts establish by clear and convincing evidence that but for
11 the constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the applicant guilty of
12 the underlying offense. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(A)-(B). However, it is not the district court
13 that decides whether a second or successive petition meets these requirements; the
14 Petitioner must first file a motion with the appropriate court of appeals to be authorized to
15 file a second or successive petition with the district court.

16 Section 2244 (b)(3)(A) provides: "Before a second or successive application
17 permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the
18 appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the
19 application." In other words, Petitioner must obtain leave from the Ninth Circuit before he
20 can file a second or successive petition in district court. See Felker v. Turpin, 518 U.S.
21 651, 656-657 (1996). This Court must dismiss any second or successive petition unless
22 the Court of Appeals has given Petitioner leave to file the petition because a district court
23 lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over a second or successive petition. Greenawalt v.
24 Stewart, 105 F.3d 1268, 1277 (9th Cir. 1997).

25 Because the current petition was filed after April 24, 1996, the provisions of the
26 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 apply to Petitioner's current
27 petition. Lindh v. Murphy, 521 U.S. 320, 327 (1997). Petitioner makes no showing that
28 he has obtained prior leave from the Ninth Circuit to file his successive petition attacking

1 the conviction. That being so, this Court has no jurisdiction to consider Petitioner's
2 renewed application for relief under Section 2254 and must dismiss the petition. See
3 Greenawalt, 105 F.3d at 1277. If Petitioner desires to proceed in bringing this petition for
4 writ of habeas corpus, he must file for leave to do so with the Ninth Circuit. See 28
5 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3).

6 **II. ORDER AND RECOMMENDATION**

7 The Court RECOMMENDS that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be
8 DISMISSED as successive. Further, the Court ORDERS the Clerk of Court to assign a
9 District Court judge to the instant matter.

10 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
11 Court Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636
12 (b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court,
13 Eastern District of California. Within thirty (30) days after being served with a copy, any
14 party may file written objections with the Court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a
15 document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and
16 Recommendations." Replies to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen
17 (14) days (plus three days if served by mail) after service of the objections. The Court
18 will then review the Magistrate Judge's ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(c).
19 Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the
20 right to appeal the District Court's order. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th
21 Cir. 2014).

22
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: January 27, 2016

/s/ Michael J. Seng
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE