

1 2002 conviction, is successive. See McNabb v. Yates, 576 F.3d 1028, 1029-1030 (9th Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (holding that a dismissal with prejudice based upon the statute of limitation renders subsequent petitions successive under the AEDPA).

"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." 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A). Absent authorization from the Court of Appeals, this Court lacks jurisdiction 10 over a successive petition. See Magwood v. Patterson, 561 U.S. 320, 11 | 330-331 (2010); Cooper v. Calderon, 274 F.3d 1270, 1274 (9th Cir. 2001), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 984 (2003).

Because petitioner has not obtained leave from the Court of Appeals to file a successive petition, the petition is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

It is so ordered.²

Dated: February 23, 2016

Christina A. Snyder United States District Judge

Rhristine a. Smyde

5

1.3

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

²²

¹ Petitioner has filed two applications for authorization to file a successive petition, both of which were denied by the Court of Appeals. Ninth Circuit Case Nos. 10-73769 and 13-71089.

² Ninth Circuit Rule No. 22-3(a) provides that "[i]f a second or successive petition or motion, or an application for authorization to file such a petition or motion, is mistakenly submitted to the district court, the district court shall refer it to the court of appeals." Because the circumstances indicate that petitioner intentionally filed this action in this Court, not that he did so mistakenly, Rule 22-3(a) is inapplicable. Nevertheless, the Clerk is directed to mail petitioner a copy of Ninth Circuit Form 12 so that petitioner may file an application for leave to file a second or successive petition in the Court of Appeals.