Revels v. Norman Doc. 23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

JAY REVELS,)	
Petitioner,)	
v.)	No. 4:12 CV1903 JMB
JEFF NORMAN,)	
Respondent,)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on petitioner's motion for relief from judgment. The motion is denied.

Petitioner argues that the undersigned lacked jurisdiction to issue a final disposition in this case, and he demands *de novo* review of the Court's judgment by a district judge. He is mistaken. Both he and respondent expressly consented to the jurisdiction of the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Rule 73 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Doc. No. 19. As a result, the argument is meritless.

Petitioner also attempts to assert a new claim for relief. He says he was never charged in an indictment, and therefore, the state court lacked jurisdiction to convict him. Petitioner cannot, however, bring a new claim for habeas relief without first receiving permission from the Court of Appeals. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A); *Gonzalez v. Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 530 (2005) (new claims presented in Rule 60(b) motion subject to restrictions on successive petitions).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's motion for relief from judgment [ECF No. 22] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURT	THER (ORDERED that the Court will not issue a certificate of appealability	y.
Dated this	6th	day of January, 2017.	

/s/ John M. Bodenhausen
JOHN M. BODENHAUSEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE