

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GERALD L. TUCKER,
Petitioner,

v.

DANIEL PARAMO, et al.,
Respondents.

Case No. 1:14-cv-00387 MJS (HC)

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO
DISMISS SUCCESSIVE PETITION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT
TO 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)**

**ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO ASSIGN DISTRICT COURT JUDGE TO
THE PRESENT MATTER**

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

In the petition filed on March 17, 2014, Petitioner challenges a July 8, 2002 conviction in the Superior Court of California, County of Tulare for custodial possession of a weapon by an inmate, with a true finding as to four prior violent or serious felony convictions within the meaning of California's Three Strikes Law, as well as a true finding as to a prior prison term within the meaning of California Penal Code § 667.5(b). Petitioner was sentenced to an indeterminate term of 25 years to life, plus a one-year enhancement, for a total sentence of 26 years to life.

A review of the Court's dockets and files shows Petitioner has previously sought habeas relief with respect to this same conviction in case number 1:04-cv-05773-LJO-

1 TAG. On August 17, 2008, the petition was denied on the merits. See Tucker v. Ryan,
2 E.D. Cal. Case No. 1:04-cv-05773-LJO-TAG, ECF Nos. 60, 64.

3 **I. DISCUSSION**

4 A court must dismiss a second or successive petition that raises the same
5 grounds as a prior petition. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1). A court must also dismiss a second
6 or successive petition raising a new ground unless the petitioner can show that 1) the
7 claim rests on a new constitutional right, made retroactive by the United States Supreme
8 Court or 2) the factual basis of the claim was not previously discoverable through due
9 diligence, and these new facts establish by clear and convincing evidence that but for
10 the constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the applicant guilty of
11 the underlying offense. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(A)-(B). However, it is not the district court
12 that decides whether a second or successive petition meets these requirements; the
13 Petitioner must first file a motion with the appropriate court of appeals to be authorized to
14 file a second or successive petition with the district court.

15 Section 2244 (b)(3)(A) provides: "Before a second or successive application
16 permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the
17 appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the
18 application." In other words, Petitioner must obtain leave from the Ninth Circuit before he
19 can file a second or successive petition in district court. See Felker v. Turpin, 518 U.S.
20 651, 656-657 (1996). This Court must dismiss any second or successive petition unless
21 the Court of Appeals has given Petitioner leave to file the petition because a district court
22 lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over a second or successive petition. Greenawalt v.
23 Stewart, 105 F.3d 1268, 1277 (9th Cir. 1997).

24 Because the current petition was filed after April 24, 1996, the provisions of the
25 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 apply to Petitioner's current
26 petition. Lindh v. Murphy, 521 U.S. 320, 327 (1997). Petitioner makes no showing that
27 he has obtained prior leave from the Ninth Circuit to file his successive petition attacking
28 the conviction. That being so, this Court has no jurisdiction to consider Petitioner's

1 renewed application for relief under Section 2254 and must dismiss the petition. See
2 Greenawalt, 105 F.3d at 1277. If Petitioner desires to proceed in bringing this petition for
3 writ of habeas corpus, he must file for leave to do so with the Ninth Circuit. See 28
4 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3).

5 **II. ORDER AND RECOMMENDATION**

6 The Court RECOMMENDS that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be
7 DISMISSED as successive.

8 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
9 Court Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636
10 (b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court,
11 Eastern District of California. Within thirty (30) days after being served with a copy, any
12 party may file written objections with the Court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a
13 document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and
14 Recommendations." Replies to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen
15 (14) days (plus three days if served by mail) after service of the objections. The Court
16 will then review the Magistrate Judge's ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(c). The
17 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the
18 right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: March 24, 2014

22 /s/ Michael J. Seng
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28