

construes petitioner's January 27, 2012 filing as a successive petition. Before a second or successive 1 2 application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the 3 appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application." 28 U.S.C. § 2244(3)(A). The instant petition is a successive petition, which requires petitioner to 4 5 seek and obtain leave of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal to pursue. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3) et 6 seq. The petitioner has not presented this Court with proof that he has obtained leave to file a 7 successive petition from the Court of Appeals. Therefore, the petition will be dismissed. Moreover, 8 to the extent that petitioner may obtain leave to file a successive petition, such petition must be 9 opened as a new case, not a continuation of the instant case, which has been closed for years.

10 1

II. Certificate of Appealability

11 In order to proceed with any appeal, petitioner must receive a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1); Fed. R. App. P. 22; 9th Cir. R. 22-1; Allen v. Ornoski, 435 F.3d 946, 950-951 12 (9th Cir. 2006); see also United States v. Mikels, 236 F.3d 550, 551-52 (9th Cir. 2001). Generally, a 13 14 petitioner must make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right" to warrant a 15 certificate of appealability. Id.; 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000). "The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's 16 17 assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Id. (quoting Slack, 529 U.S. at 484). In 18 order to meet this threshold inquiry, the petitioner has the burden of demonstrating that the issues are 19 debatable among jurists of reason; that a court could resolve the issues differently; or that the 20 questions are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. Id.

Pursuant to the December 1, 2009 amendment to Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section
2254 and 2255 Cases, district courts are required to rule on the certificate of appealability in the
order disposing of a proceeding adversely to the petitioner or movant, rather than waiting for a notice
of appeal and request for certificate of appealability to be filed. Rule 11(a). This Court has
considered the issues raised by petitioner, with respect to whether they satisfy the standard for

26

1	issuance of a certificate of appealability, and determines that none meet that standard. The Court
2	therefore denies petitioner a certificate of appealability.
3	III. Conclusion
4	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this petitioner's "re-application for petition of writ of
5	habeas corpus" (ECF No. 32) is DISMISSED with prejudice as a successive petition.
6	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner is DENIED A CERTIFICATE OF
7	APPEALABILITY.
8	Dated this 31 st day of January, 2012.
9	Edward C. Red.
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
24 25	
23 26	
20	3