

1 “erroneously” dismissed. (*See* Objections at 1, 8.) In effect, Petitioner seeks to set
2 aside the Court’s October 30, 2015 summary dismissal, thereby rendering his “[I]nitial
3 [P]etition [] timely.” (*See* Objections at 8.) The Court thus liberally construes
4 Petitioner’s argument as a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) for relief from judgment.

5 As a rule, parties seeking relief from judgment must file a motion under:
6 (1) Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1)-(3) within one year; or (2) Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4)-(6)
7 within a “reasonable time.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c). However, “[t]o receive relief
8 under Rule 60(b)(6), a party must demonstrate ‘extraordinary circumstances which
9 prevented or rendered him unable to prosecute [his case].’” *Lal v. California*, 610 F.3d
10 518, 524 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal citations omitted).

11 Here, none of the grounds for relief under the Rule 60(b) are applicable. First,
12 because more than one year has passed since the October 30, 2015 summary dismissal
13 of Petitioner’s prior federal petition, Rules 60(b)(1)-(3) are inapplicable. Second,
14 because Petitioner does not claim that the prior judgment was void, satisfied, released,
15 or discharged, Rules 60(b)(4)-(5) are inapplicable.

16 Third, because Petitioner fails to claim that “there were ‘extraordinary
17 circumstances’ beyond [his] control that prevented [him] from taking timely action to
18 prevent or correct an [allegedly] erroneous judgment,” Rule 60(b)(6) is also
19 inapplicable. *See Franklin v. Scribner*, 2008 WL 1817263, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 16,
20 2008). In fact, Petitioner was able to file two additional state habeas petitions shortly
21 after the Court’s October 3, 2015 dismissal. [Dkt. Nos. 18-4, 18-6.] Thus, there does
22 not appear to have been any extraordinary circumstances preventing Petitioner from
23 filing a timely motion for relief from judgment.

24 As such, the Court accepts the finding and recommendation in the R&R, but
25 notes one clarification: because the Petition was filed on April 25, 2016, [Dkt. No. 1 at
26 9], it was untimely by one month when accounting for all statutory tolling. *See* 28
27 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1-2).

1 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 2 1. The Report and Recommendation, with the aforementioned
3 clarification, is approved and accepted;
- 4 2. Judgment be entered dismissing this action with prejudice;
- 5 3. All pending motions are denied as moot and terminated; and
- 6 4. The Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

7 Additionally, for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation, the
8 Court finds that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a
9 constitutional right. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253; Fed. R. App. P. 22(b); *Miller-El v.*
10 *Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003). Thus, the Court declines to issue a certificate of
11 appealability.

12
13 DATED: February 8, 2017



14
15 HON. JOSEPHINE L. STATON
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28