the appellate court, the district court is without jurisdiction to consider a second or successive

27

28

petition. See Burton, 549 U.S. 147.

In the present action, petitioner challenges the conviction for attempted criminal threats entered in the California Superior Court, County of Placer, case number 62009078. ECF No. 1 at 1. The court has examined its records, and finds that petitioner challenged the same judgment of conviction in an earlier action. Specifically, in *Oubichon v. CDCR*, No. 2:07-cv-0838-GEB-CHS (E.D. Cal.), the court considered petitioner's challenge to the same judgment of conviction. *See Oubichon*, ECF No. 42 (magistrate judge's December 1, 2008 findings and recommendations to deny petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus on the merits); ECF No. 46 (district judge's January 21, 2009 order adopting findings and recommendations and denying petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus). Since petitioner challenges the same judgment now that he previously challenged and which was adjudicated on the merits, the petition now pending is second or successive.

Petitioner offers no evidence that the appellate court has authorized this court to consider a second or successive petition. Since petitioner has not demonstrated that the appellate court has authorized this court to consider a second or successive petition, this action must be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *See Burton*, 549 U.S. 147; *Cooper v. Calderon*, 274 F.3d 1270, 1274 (9th Cir. 2001) (per curiam).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any reply to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen days after service of the objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. *Turner v. Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). In his objections petitioner may address whether a certificate of appealability should issue in the event he files an appeal of the judgment in this case. *See* Rule 11, Federal Rules Governing

1	Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts (the district court must issue or deny a
2	certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant).
3	DATED: October 3, 2017.
4	Elmund F. Bieman
5	EDMUND F. BRENNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	