

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RODNEY OWENS, ) CASE NO. CV 11-08477 GHK (RZ)  
Petitioner, )  
vs. ) ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING  
KELLY HARRINGTON, Warden, ) PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS  
Respondent. ) CORPUS WITHOUT PREJUDICE

This habeas petition is successive and lacks the required Court of Appeals authorization for such a petition. As a result, this Court will dismiss it summarily for lack of jurisdiction to entertain it.

Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts provides that “[i]f it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court, the judge shall make an order for its summary dismissal and cause the petitioner to be notified.”

Section 2244 of Title 28, part of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, requires that the district court dismiss most successive habeas corpus petitions:

111

(b)(1) A claim presented in a second or successive habeas corpus application under section 2254 that was presented in a prior application shall be dismissed.

(2) A claim presented in a second or successive habeas corpus application under section 2254 that was not presented in a prior application shall be dismissed unless –

(A) the applicant shows that the claim relies on a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable; or

(B) (i) the factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence; and

(ii) the facts underlying the claim, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the applicant guilty of the underlying offense.

(3)(A) Before a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application.

In *Felker v. Turpin*, 518 U.S. 651, 656-57, 116 S. Ct. 2333, 135 L. Ed. 2d 827 Supreme Court noted that this statute transferred the screening function for petitions from the district court to the court of appeals. This provision has been jurisdictional; the district court cannot entertain a successive petition without leave from the Court of Appeals. *Cooper v. Calderon*, 274 F.3d 1270, 1274 (9th

1 Cir. 2001). The district court therefore either must dismiss a successive petition for lack  
2 of jurisdiction, or it may transfer the action, in the interest of justice, to the court where the  
3 action properly could have been brought. 28 U.S.C. § 1631; *Pratt v. United States*, 129  
4 F.3d 54, 57 (1st Cir. 1997).

5 In the Petition before the Court, Petitioner Rodney Owens attacks his 1996  
6 convictions of armed carjacking and other crimes and/or the sentence imposed. He  
7 previously challenged that conviction on habeas in this Court, however, and the Court  
8 denied relief on the merits and dismissed that action with prejudice. *See* docket in *Owens*  
9 *v. Garcia*, No. CV 98-10652 DT (RZ) (Judgment filed September 23, 1999). Petitioner has  
10 not obtained Ninth Circuit authorization, as is required before he properly may file another  
11 habeas petition in this Court. No factors appear which make it preferable to transfer this  
12 case to the Court of Appeals, rather than dismissing it.

13 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the Petition is dismissed.  
14

15 DATED: October 25, 2011  
16

17   
18 GEORGE H. KING  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28