

DOCUMENT

A

Federal District Court Petition
For Writ Of Habeas Corpus

Exhibit A-1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PHILLIP ROSENBLUM,) NO. ED CV 18-1430-JVS(E)
Petitioner,)
v.) ORDER OF DISMISSAL
MARTIN BITER,)
Respondent.)

)

On July 5, 2018, Petitioner filed a "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus By a Person in State Custody." The Petition challenges the criminal judgment in San Bernardino Superior Court case number FCH-05652 (Petition at 2). Petitioner previously challenged this same judgment in a prior habeas corpus petition filed in this Court. See Rosenblum v. Yates, CV 08-261-JVS(E). On January 13, 2009, this Court entered Judgment in Rosenblum v. Yates, CV 08-261-JVS(E), denying and dismissing the prior petition on the merits with prejudice.

The Court must dismiss the present Petition in accordance with 28 U.S.C. section 2244(b) (as amended by the "Antiterrorism and

Exhibit A-2

1 Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996"). Section 2244(b) requires that
2 a petitioner seeking to file a "second or successive" habeas petition
3 first obtain authorization from the court of appeals. See Burton v.
4 Stewart, 549 U.S. 147, 157 (2007) (where petitioner did not receive
5 authorization from Court of Appeals before filing second or successive
6 petition, "the District Court was without jurisdiction to entertain
7 [the petition]"); Barapind v. Reno, 225 F.3d 1100, 1111 (9th Cir.
8 2000) ("the prior-appellate-review mechanism set forth in § 2244(b)
9 requires the permission of the court of appeals before 'a second or
10 successive habeas application under § 2254' may be commenced"). A
11 petition need not be repetitive to be "second or successive," within
12 the meaning of 28 U.S.C. section 2244(b). See, e.g., Thompson v.
13 Calderon, 151 F.3d 918, 920-21 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 524 U.S. 965
14 (1998); Calbert v. Marshall, 2008 WL 649798, at *2-4 (C.D. Cal. Mar.
15 6, 2008). Petitioner evidently has not yet obtained authorization
16 from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.¹ Consequently, this Court
17 cannot entertain the present Petition. See Burton v. Stewart, 549
18 U.S. at 157.²

19 | //

20 | //

21 | //

22 | //

24 ¹ The docket for the United States Court of Appeals for
25 the Ninth Circuit available on www.pacer.gov., does not reflect
26 that anyone named Phillip Rosenblum has received authorization to
file a second or successive petition. See Mir v. Little Company
of Mary Hosp., 844 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1988) (court may take
judicial notice of court records).

28 || This Court previously denied as "second or successive"
2 a 2011 petition in which Petitioner attempted to challenge the
same San Bernardino Superior Court criminal judgment.
See Rosenblum v. Harrington, No. ED CV 11-793-JVS(E).

Exhibit A-3

1 For all of the foregoing reasons, the Petition is denied and
2 dismissed without prejudice.³

3

4 LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

5

6 DATED: July 9, 2018



7
8 JAMES V. SELNA
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10

11

12

13

14 PRESENTED this 9th day of

15 July, 2018, by:

16

17

/S/

18 CHARLES F. EICK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19

20

21

22

23

24

25 ³ Ninth Circuit Rule 22-3(a) provides that "if a second
or successive petition . . . is mistakenly submitted to the
26 district court, the district court shall refer it to the court of
appeals." Assuming arguendo that the conflict between 28 U.S.C.
27 section 2244(b) and Rule 22-3(a) does not invalidate the latter,
dismissal rather than "reference" still would be appropriate
herein. It is apparent that Petitioner submitted the present
28 Petition to this Court intentionally rather than mistakenly.

EXHIBIT

B

9th Circuit Denial Of
Certificate Of Appealability

Exhibit B

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PHILLIP J. ROSENBLUM,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

MARTIN BITER, Warden,

Respondent-Appellee.

No. 18-56061

D.C. No. 5:18-cv-01430-JVS-E
Central District of California,
Riverside

ORDER

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

Before: SILVERMAN and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

The court has considered all filings submitted by appellant in support of his request for a certificate of appealability. The request for a certificate of appealability 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.