



*California*, 530 U.S. 392, 412-13 (2000); *Brown v. D.C.*, 514 F.3d 1279, 1285-86 (D.C. Cir. 2008)), and a “district court may apply res judicata upon taking judicial notice of [a] [party’s] previous case.” *Tinsley v. Equifax Credit Info. Serv’s, Inc.*, No. 99-7031, 1999 WL 506720 (D.C. Cir. June 2, 1999) (per curiam) (citing *Gullo v. Veterans Cooperative Housing Ass’n*, 269 F.2d 517 (D.C. Cir. 1959) (per curiam)). Furthermore, “the doctrine of res judicata [or claim preclusion] applies to dismissal[s] for lack of jurisdiction as well as for other grounds . . . .” *Dozier v. Ford Motor Co.*, 702 F. 2d 1189, 1191 (D.C. Cir. 1983); see *GAF Corp. v. United States*, 818 F.2d 901, 912-13 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (“[A] judgment ordering dismissal[] . . . will, for example, preclude relitigation of the precise issue of jurisdiction that led to the initial dismissal.”).

“For claim preclusion to apply, there must be (1) an identity of parties in both suits; (2) a judgment rendered by a court of competent jurisdiction; (3) a final judgment on the merits; and (4) the same cause of action in both suits.” *Graham*, 2005 WL 3276180 at \*4 (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). Petitioner has named the same warden in both actions and is challenging the same sentence of 37 years to life imposed by the Superior Court on May 12, 1994, following his convictions for assault with intent to kill, mayhem while armed, possession of a firearm during a crime of violence, carrying a pistol without a license, and possessing unregistered ammunition. Cf. Pet. at 1 with *Hiligh v. Quintana*, Civ. Action No. 10-1717, Pet. at 2.

Here, petitioner makes similar arguments about the DCCA’s review of his conviction that warranted dismissal of the prior action because “a federal district court lacks jurisdiction to review the decisions of the D.C. Court of Appeals.” *Hiligh v. Quintana*, Civ. Action No. 10-

