



1 of conviction on June 12, 2001. Remittitur issued on September 26, 2001. Exhibit 50.

2           Petitioner filed his first post-conviction petition for writ of habeas corpus in state  
3 district court on July 13, 2001. Exhibit 47. The court denied the petition in an order entered March  
4 5, 2002. Exhibit 58. Petitioner appealed and the Nevada Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of  
5 the state district court on July 25, 2002. Exhibit 66. Remittitur issued on August 21, 2002. Exhibit  
6 67.

7           On August 1, 2002, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in this court.  
8 Exhibit 68. This court denied the petition on July 2, 2004. Exhibits 70, 71, 73. On November 23,  
9 2004, the Ninth Circuit denied petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability. Exhibit 75. The  
10 United States Supreme Court denied petitioner's petition for writ of certiorari on April 18, 2005.  
11 Exhibit 79.

12           On May 23, 2005, petitioner sought leave from the Ninth Circuit to file a second or  
13 successive petition. Exhibit 80. On June 21, 2005, the Ninth Circuit denied petitioner's application  
14 for authorization to file a second or successive petition because he failed to satisfy the requirements  
15 of 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2). Exhibit 81.

16           Petitioner filed a second state post-conviction petition for writ of habeas corpus on  
17 July 25, 2005. Exhibits 82, 83. The state district court dismissed the petition on the ground that it  
18 was procedurally barred. Exhibit 85. The Nevada Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of the  
19 district court. Exhibit 93. Remittitur issued on June 22, 2006. Exhibit 94. The United States  
20 denied petitioner's petition for writ of certiorari on October 16, 2006. Exhibit 98, 99.

21           This court received the present petition for writ of habeas corpus on May 5, 2009.  
22 Respondents filed the motion to dismiss now pending before the court on March 8, 2010. Docket  
23 #17. Petitioner filed a response to the motion on March 24, 2010, to which respondents filed a reply  
24 on April 5, 2010. Docket #26.

25 //

26 //

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 Respondents move to dismiss this petition for writ of habeas corpus on the ground  
3 that petitioner has not been granted permission by the Ninth Circuit to file a second or successive  
4 petition. Petitioner has filed a response to respondents’ motion in which he argues the merits of his  
5 claims. He does not address the basis of respondents’ motion to dismiss.

6 Under AEDPA's “gatekeeping” provisions, an applicant seeking to file a second or  
7 successive petition must obtain from the appropriate court of appeals an order authorizing the district  
8 court to consider the application. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A). Section 2244(b)(2) provides that a  
9 claim presented in a second or successive habeas corpus application under section 2254 that was not  
10 presented in a prior application shall be dismissed unless a court of appeals makes a finding that:

11 (A) the applicant shows that the claim relies on a new rule of constitutional law made  
12 retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously  
unavailable; or

13 (B)(I) the factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered  
14 previously through the exercise of due diligence; and

15 (ii) the facts underling the claim, if proven and viewed in the light of the  
16 evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and  
convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable  
17 fact finder would have found the applicant guilty of the underlying  
offense.

18 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(A)-(B). The requirement that a petitioner obtain authorization from the  
19 court of appeals before filing a second or successive petition is jurisdictional. *Burton v. Stewart*, 549  
20 U.S. 147, 152 (2007). If a federal habeas petition is dismissed on the merits, a subsequent petition  
21 challenging the same judgment or conviction is a second or successive petition for purposes of the  
22 AEDPA. *See, Henderson v. Lampert*, 396 F.3d 1049, 1052-53 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005). Further, a federal  
23 habeas corpus petition is a second or successive petition if it raises claims that were or could have  
24 been resolved on the merits in prior petition. *Woods v. Carey*, 525 F.3d 886 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008).

25 Petitioner filed his first federal habeas corpus petition on August 1, 2002, challenging  
26 his January 29, 2001 burglary conviction. This court denied the petition on the merits and denied

1 petitioner a certificate of appealability. Exhibits 70, 71 and 73. The Ninth Circuit subsequently  
2 denied petitioner's application to file a second or successive petition. Exhibit 81. Despite that  
3 denial, petitioner has now filed a second habeas corpus petition in this court, again challenging his  
4 January 29, 2001 burglary conviction. Under the authorities discussed above, this is a second or  
5 successive petition which this court lacks authorization to consider. Accordingly, this court lacks  
6 jurisdiction over the matter.

7 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents' motion to dismiss is  
8 **GRANTED.** (Docket #17.) This petition for writ of habeas corpus is dismissed for lack of  
9 jurisdiction. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment for respondents and to close this  
10 case. Any outstanding motions are denied as moot.

11 DATED: October 28, 2010

12 

13  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26