(HC) Jaspar	v. Knowles, et al
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	MATTHEW LEE JASPAR,
12	
13	
	VS.  MIKE KNOWLES Worden et al.
14	MIKE KNOWLES, Warden, et al.,
15	Respondents. <u>ORDER</u>
16	
17	On March 30, 2009, the court determined that petitioner's application for writ of
18	habeas corpus is successive under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3) and dismissed the petition without
19	prejudice to refiling upon obtaining the necessary authorization from the United States Court of
20	Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Petitioner now asks that the court transfer this action to the Ninth
21	Circuit so that he may obtain the necessary authorization. However, transfer is not necessary or
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	1

Doc. 16

warranted because petitioner may file his request for authorization with the Ninth Circuit by himself. Therefore, petitioner's request for transfer (#15) is denied. DATED: July 13, 2009. jasp1207.suc