

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Gazaway v. State of California

Gazaway · No. 2:23-CV-0699-WBS-DMC-P · Decided June 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied Jerrald D. Gazaway’s motion to amend the August 30, 2024 final judgment in his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus action. The court concluded that relief under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 52(b) and 59(e) was unavailable because the motion was filed more than 28 days after entry of judgment, and Rule 59(a) did not apply because no trial occurred.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 JERRALD D. GAZAWAY, No. 2:23-CV-0699-WBS-DMC-
P 12 Petitioner, 13 v. ORDER 14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner, a
state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought this petition for a writ of 18 habeas corpus pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 2254. Final judgment was entered on August 30, 2024.

19 See ECF No. 43. Pending before the Court in this closed action is Petitioner’s motion to amend
20 the judgment. See ECF No. 45. 21 In his motion, Petitioner states that he seeks relief pursuant
to Federal Rules of 22 Civil Procedure 52(b), 59(a), and/or 59(e). See id. Rule 52(b) outlines
procedures for a motion 23 to amend or make additional findings related to a final judgment.

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b). 24 Relief under that provision is unavailable in this case because a
motion under Rule 52(b) must be 25 filed within 28 days after entry of judgment and Petitioner’s
pending motion was filed on January 26 13, 2025, which is more than 28 days after entry of final
judgment on August 30, 2024.

The 27 Court will, therefore, analyze Petitioner’s motion under Rule 59(a) and (e). 28 / / / 1 Rule
59(a), which governs motions for a new trial, is inapplicable in this case 2 | because no trial was
held. Generally, a motion to alter or amend a final judgment is appropriately 3 | brought under
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). See Backlund v. Barnhart, 778 F.2d 1386, 4 | 1388 (9th Cir.
1985) (discussing reconsideration of summary judgment); see also Schroeder v. 5 | McDonald, 55
F.3d 454, 458-59 (9th Cir. 1995). The motion must be filed no later than twenty- 6 | eight (28)
days after entry of the judgment.! See Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e).

As with relief under Rule 7 | 52(b), relief under Rule 59(e) is also unavailable in this case because
Petitioner's motion was 8 | filed more than 28 days after entry of final judgment. 9 Accordingly,
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's motion to amend the 10 | August 30, 2024, final
judgment, ECF No. 45, is DENIED. 11 | Dated: June 17, 2025 Jy Ld. ak. AY / 12
WILLIAMB.SHUBB B UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
25 26 | ——— □ Pursuant to *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266 (1988), for pro se prisoner litigants
27 | seeking reconsideration, the court calculates the 28-day period from the date the motion was
delivered to prison authorities for mailing to the court.

Otherwise, the 28-day period is 28 | calculated based on the date the motion for reconsideration is
actually filed.