On July 26, 2010, Petitioner filed a petition for writ of mandamus with this Court. (Pet.,

28

2

345

6 7 8

10 11

9

13 14

12

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

2728

__

hear the merits of his habeas petition.

The All Writs Act provides in relevant part that "It he Supreme Court and all courts

ECF No. 31.) By way of the petition for writ of mandamus, petitioner requests that the Court

The All Writs Act provides in relevant part that "[t]he Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law." 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a). Under this authority, the writ of mandamus may be used in the federal courts to confine an inferior court to a lawful exercise of its prescribed jurisdiction or to compel it to exercise its authority when it is its duty to do so. Will v. United States, 389 U.S. 90, 95, 88 S. Ct. 269, 19 L. Ed. 2d 305 (1967).

Here, the Ninth Circuit has already denied Petitioner's request to grant such a writ. Further, this Court finds the petition for writ of mandate procedurally inappropriate. A writ of mandate is used to compel a lower court to act, not to have the court of original jurisdiction review its own decision. A challenge in this Court of a judgment by this Court may in an appropriate case be made by way of a motion for reconsideration. Accordingly, construing Petitioner's pleadings in a light most favorable to Petitioner, the Court shall consider the petition for writ of mandamus a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure section 60(b).

Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides:

On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:

(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;

(2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b):

(3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party;

(4) the judgment is void;

(5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or

(6) any other reason that justifies relief.

Petitioner does not set forth any arguments or evidence that merit reconsideration. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus was both successive and untimely. Petitioner has

1	not shown that he has obtained permission from the Ninth Circuit to proceed with a successive
2	petition, nor has Petitioner presented any grounds under Rule 60(b) as to why the matter
3	should be granted relief.
4	Petitioner's petition for writ of mandamus, even if construed as a motion for
5	reconsideration, is therefore DENIED. No further pleadings shall be considered in the present
6	action.
7	
8	
9	
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	Dated: November 1, 2011
12	ONTED OTATEO MIXOTOTIVATE GODGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	