

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

9

\* \* \*

10 CHARLES KELLY CHAVEZ,

Case No. 3:13-cv-00059-MMD-VPC

11

Petitioner,

ORDER

12

v.

13

ISIDRO BACA, et al.,

14

Respondents.

15

16

This action is a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, by a Nevada state prisoner.

17

18

The petition in the instant action challenges petitioner's state conviction in case number 97C146562. Petitioner previously challenged this same conviction in this Court, filed under case number 2:03-cv-00173-KJD-LRL. The petition in case number 2:03-cv-00173-KJD-LRL was reviewed on the merits and denied by order filed May 15, 2008. (Dkt. no. 32.) Judgment was entered on May 16, 2008. (Dkt. no. 33.) Petitioner appealed. (Dkt. no. 34.) By order filed June 21, 2010, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed the denial of the habeas petition. (Dkt. no. 42.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Before a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the 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 seek and obtain

26

27

28

1 leave of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal to pursue. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3) *et seq.*  
2 In the prior habeas case in which petitioner challenged his conviction (case number  
3 2:03-cv-00173-KJD-LRL), the Court reviewed the merits of the petition and denied the  
4 petition by order filed May 15, 2008. (Dkt. no. 32.) Because the prior habeas corpus  
5 petition was decided on the merits, the instant habeas petition is a successive petition.  
6 *McNabb v. Yates*, 576 F.3d 1028, 1029 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009). Although petitioner in the instant  
7 case has attached to his petition an application for leave to file a second or successive  
8 petition (dkt. no. 1-3), he has not presented this Court with proof that he has actually  
9 obtained leave to file a successive petition from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.  
10 Therefore, the instant petition will be dismissed as successive.

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

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

1 of appealability, and determines that none meet that standard. The Court will therefore  
2 deny petitioner a certificate of appealability.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED as a successive  
4 petition.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner is DENIED a Certificate of  
6 Appealability.


7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.

8

9 DATED THIS 8<sup>th</sup> day of February 2013.

10

11

  
MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28