

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAY 4 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JOSE J. HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

M. ELIOT SPEARMAN,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 18-15321

D.C. No.

1:17-cv-01625-AWI-JLT

Eastern District of California,
Fresno

ORDER

Before: BYBEE and BEA, Circuit Judges.

The request for a certificate of appealability (Docket Entry No. 2) is denied because appellant has not shown that “jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012).

Any pending motions are denied as moot.

DENIED.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE DE JESUS HERNANDEZ,

Case No. 1:17-cv-01625-JLT (HC)

Petitioner,

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO
DISMISS SUCCESSIVE PETITION FOR
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

M. E. SPEARMAN,

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO ASSIGN DISTRICT JUDGE

Respondent.

[TWENTY-ONE DAY OBJECTION
DEADLINE]

On December 1, 2017, Petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus in this Court. Because the petition is successive, the Court will recommend it be **DISMISSED**.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On September 26, 2007, Petitioner was convicted in the Tulare County Superior Court of: first degree felony murder with a robbery/burglary special circumstance; attempted murder of a peace officer with a special allegation that the offense occurred while the officer was engaged in the performance of his duties; four counts of second degree robbery with personal use of a firearm; three counts of second degree commercial burglary; conspiracy to commit robbery; unlawfully taking or driving a vehicle; and receiving a stolen vehicle. He is serving a sentence of life without the possibility of parole.

The instant petition challenges the 2007 conviction and raises the following claims for

1 relief: 1) Ineffective assistance of counsel due to failure to raise claims on appeal; 2) Evidence
2 was insufficient to support the conviction for first degree felony murder; 3) An ambiguous jury
3 instruction on felony murder unconstitutionally relieved the state of its burden of proof of an
4 element of the crime; 4) The evidence does not support a finding that the attempted murder is a
5 reasonably foreseeable natural and probable consequence; 5) The trial court's denial to continue
6 the trial violated Petitioner's due process rights and his right to prepare a defense for trial; and 6)
7 The court imposed an illegal and excessive restitution fine.

8 The instant petition is not Petitioner's first federal petition. On February 25, 2010,
9 Petitioner filed a federal petition for writ of habeas corpus in this Court challenging the same
10 conviction. See Hernandez v. New Folsom State Prison Warden, Case No.: 1:10-cv-00391-LJO-
11 JLT (HC). The District Court denied the petition on the merits on May 11, 2012. Petitioner
12 appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on May 30, 2012, and the appellate court denied
13 the appeal on July 25, 2013.

14 **DISCUSSION**

15 A federal court must dismiss a second or successive petition that raises the same grounds
16 as a prior petition. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1). The court must also dismiss a second or successive
17 petition raising a new ground unless the petitioner can show that 1) the claim rests on a new,
18 retroactive, constitutional right or 2) the factual basis of the claim was not previously
19 discoverable through due diligence, and these new facts establish by clear and convincing
20 evidence that but for the constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the
21 applicant guilty of the underlying offense. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(A)-(B). However, it is not the
22 district court that decides whether a second or successive petition meets these requirements.

23 Section 2244 (b)(3)(A) provides: "Before a second or successive application permitted by
24 this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of
25 appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application." In other words,
26 Petitioner must obtain leave from the Ninth Circuit before he can file a second or successive
27 petition in district court. See Felker v. Turpin, 518 U.S. 651, 656-657 (1996). This Court must
28 dismiss any second or successive petition unless the Court of Appeals has given Petitioner leave

1 to file the petition because a district court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over a second or
2 successive petition. Burton v. Stewart, 549 U.S. 147, 152 (2007); Cooper v. Calderon, 274 F.3d
3 1270, 1274 (9th Cir. 2001).

4 Because the current petition was filed after April 24, 1996, the provisions of the
5 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) apply to Petitioner's current
6 petition. Lindh v. Murphy, 521 U.S. 320, 327 (1997). Petitioner makes no showing that he has
7 obtained prior leave from the Ninth Circuit to file his successive petition attacking the
8 conviction. That being so, this Court has no jurisdiction to consider Petitioner's renewed
9 application for relief from that conviction under Section 2254 and must dismiss the petition. See
10 Greenawalt, 105 F.3d at 1277; Nunez, 96 F.3d at 991.

11 **ORDER**

12 Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to assign a District Judge to this case.

13 **RECOMMENDATION**

14 For the foregoing reasons, the Court RECOMMENDS that the petition be DISMISSED
15 as successive.

16 This Findings and Recommendation is submitted to the United States District Court
17 Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. section 636 (b)(1)(B) and
18 Rule 304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court, Eastern District of
19 California. Within twenty-one days after being served with a copy, Petitioner may file written
20 objections with the Court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
21 Judge's Findings and Recommendation." The Court will then review the Magistrate Judge's
22 ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C). Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections
23 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v.
24 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26
27 Dated: December 11, 2017

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE DE JESUS HERNANDEZ.

No. 1:17-cv-01625-AWI-JLT (HC)

Petitioner,

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS (Doc. No. 7)**

v

M. E. SPEARMAN.

Respondent.

ORDER DISMISSING SUCCESSIVE
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO ENTER JUDGMENT AND CLOSE
CASE

**ORDER DECLINING TO ISSUE
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding in propria persona with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On December 12, 2017, the Magistrate Judge assigned to the case issued Findings and Recommendation to dismiss the petition as successive. (Doc. No. 7.) This Findings and Recommendation was served upon all parties and contained a provision that any objections were to be filed within twenty-one days from the date of service of that document. On January 2, 2018, Petitioner filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations. (Doc. No. 8.)

27 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a
28 de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Petitioner's

1 objections, the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation is
2 supported by the record and proper analysis. Petitioner's objections present no grounds for
3 questioning the Magistrate Judge's analysis.

4 In addition, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner
5 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of
6 his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537
7 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate of
8 appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:

9 (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a district
10 judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of appeals for the circuit
 in which the proceeding is held.

11 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the
12 validity of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or trial a person
 charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of such person's
 detention pending removal proceedings.

13 (c)(1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may
14 not be taken to the court of appeals from—

15 (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention
16 complained of arises out of process issued by a State court; or

17 (B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.

18 (2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the applicant has
 made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

19 (3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which specific issue
20 or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

21 If a court denies a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of
22 appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.
23 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that
24 "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have
25 been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve
26 encouragement to proceed further.'" *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting
27 *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).

28 In the present case, the Court finds that Petitioner has not made the required substantial

1 showing of the denial of a constitutional right to justify the issuance of a certificate of
2 appealability. Reasonable jurists would not find the Court's determination that Petitioner is not
3 entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to
4 proceed further. Thus, the Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.

5 Accordingly, the Court orders as follows:

6 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed December 12, 2017 (Doc. No. 7), is
7 ADOPTED IN FULL;

8 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED as successive;
9 3. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to ENTER JUDGMENT and close the file; and,
10 4. The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.

11 This order terminates the action in its entirety.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: February 6, 2018



14 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**