

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison Claire
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2:25-cv-3755 AC P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner filed a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition challenging convictions arising from one of three criminal cases resolved by a global plea agreement. Because another habeas petition challenging the same single judgment was already pending, the court construed this petition as a motion to amend the earlier petition and ordered the case closed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Chijioke Chukwuma Isamade v. Jim Cooper

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- successive petitions
- motion to amend
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a habeas petition challenging convictions included in the same single judgment as convictions challenged in an earlier pending petition must be treated as a second or successive petition.
2. Whether the later-filed pro se habeas petition should instead be construed as a motion to amend the earlier pending petition.

HOLDINGS

1. A petitioner must raise all claims relating to a single judgment in one habeas petition; a new petition challenging the same judgment while an earlier petition remains pending cannot proceed as a separate action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“ “[W]hen a pro se petitioner files a new petition in the district court while an earlier-filed petition is still pending, the district court must construe the new petition as a motion to amend the pending petition rather than as an unauthorized second or successive petition.” ” (at 1-2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a county prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. His convictions in Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 21FE019505 resulted from a global plea agreement involving two additional criminal cases and a single judgment encompassing all three cases. He had another federal habeas petition pending that challenged the convictions arising from the other two cases.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner sought federal habeas relief from a Sacramento County Superior Court conviction. The court determined that the challenged conviction was part of a single judgment encompassing three cases and that petitioner had already filed a pending habeas petition concerning the same judgment in *Isamade v. Allison*, No. 2:25-cv-1216 JDP. The court ordered the Clerk to file this petition as a motion to amend and proposed amended petition in the earlier case and to close this action.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Clerk of Court was ordered to file the petition in this case as a motion to amend and proposed amended petition in *Isamade v. Allison*, No. 2:25-cv-1216 JDP, and close this case.

CASES CITED

- *Isamade v. Allison*, No. 2:25-cv-1216 JDP (E.D. Cal.)
- *Goodrum v. Busby*, 824 F.3d 1188, 1192 (9th Cir. 2016)

- Woods v. Carey, 525 F.3d 886, 887-90 (9th Cir. 2008)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2026/chijioke-chukwuma-isamade-v-jim-cooper-l75f62dc>