

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Chijioke Chukwuma Isamade v. Jim Cooper

Isamade v. Cooper · No. No. 2:25-cv-3755 AC P · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The court ordered that a habeas petition challenging convictions arising from a global plea agreement be filed as a motion to amend a previously pending habeas petition because both petitions challenged the same judgment. The court directed the Clerk to file the petition and proposed amended petition in the earlier case and close the present case.

OPINION

Cooper

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 CHIJOKE CHUKWUMA ISAMADE, No. 2:25-cv-3755 AC P

12 Petitioner, 13 v. ORDER

14 JIM COOPER,

15 Respondent. 16

17 Petitioner, a county prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed a petition 18 for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in which he seeks to challenge his 19 conviction in Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 21FE019505. ECF No. 1. The 20 petition and exhibits reveal that petitioner's convictions in Case No. 21FE019505 were the result 21 of a global plea agreement involving two other cases and resulting in a single judgment for all 22 three cases. Id. at 12, 54-56 (court of appeals opinion), 64-67 (abstract of judgment). The 23 petition further indicates, and court records confirm, that petitioner has another habeas petition 24 pending in this court challenging the convictions arising out of the two other cases involved in the 25 global plea agreement. Id. at 12; see also Isamade v. Allison (Isamade I), No. 2:25-cv-1216 JDP 26 (E.D. Cal.). 27 Because of the bar against second or successive habeas petitions, petitioner must raise all 28 claims relating to a judgment in a single petition. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b) (requiring dismissal of 1 | claims brought in a second or successive petition except in very limited circumstances). 2 || Although petitioner's plea agreement involved three different criminal cases, the result was a 3 || single judgment encompassing all three cases. See ECF No. | at 64-67.

Because the instant 4 || petition challenges the same judgment as the petition in Isamade I, it cannot proceed as a separate 5 || proceeding. “[W]hen a pro se petitioner files a new petition in the district court while an earlier- 6 || filed petition is still pending, the district court must construe the new petition as a motion to 7 || amend the pending petition rather than as an unauthorized second or successive petition.” 8 | Goodrum v. Busby, 824 F.3d 1188, 1192 (9th Cir. 2016) (emphasis omitted) (citing Woods v. 9 | Carey, 525 F.3d 886, 887-90 (9th Cir. 2008)). 10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall file the petition 11 || in this case as a motion to amend and proposed amended petition in Isamade v. Allison, No. 2:25- 12 || cv-1216 JDP, and close this case. 13 | DATED: January 8, 2026 14 Chttien— Chane

ALLISON CLAIRE

Id UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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