1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6		
7		I
8	MANUEL JOSE MAES, JR.,	CASE NO. C07-1292 BHS
9	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING
10	v.	PETITIONER'S MOTION
11	LEA ANN CHRONES,	
12	Respondent.	
13		
	This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner Manuel Jose Maes, Jr.'s	
14	("Maes") motion for relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60 (Dkt. 38).	
15	On March 12, 2009, the Court denied Maes's petition for writ of habeas corpus.	
16	(Dkt. 32) and entered judgment in favor of Respondent (Dkt. 33). On October 28, 2013,	
17	Maes filed the instant motion arguing for relief from that judgment because of ineffective	
18	assistance of counsel appointed to prosecute Maes's petition. Dkt. 38.	
19	Rule 60(b)(6) is a catch-all provision that should be used "sparingly as an	
20	equitable remedy to prevent manifest injustice." United States v. Alpine Land &	
21	Reservoir Co., 984 F.2d 1047, 1049 (9th Cir. 1	1993).
22		

In this case, Maes has failed to show a manifest injustice in the denial of his original petition. Although Maes alleges various errors of counsel, none of these errors relate to the grounds for relief that were before this Court in Maes's original petition. Therefore, the Court **DENIES** the motion because there is no reason to relieve Maes from the judgment for Respondent on the issues that were presented to the Court. If Maes requests relief based on additional grounds, he may file a second or successive petition for a writ of habeas corpus with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. See Ninth Circuit Local Rule 22-3 (application for authorization to file second or successive petition). The Court, however, declines to *sua sponte* convert this motion into an application for a second or successive petition. Dated this 19th day of November, 2013. United States District Judge