

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rodney Carter v. L. Martinez

Carter v. Martinez · No. 8:21-cv-01833-JWH-MAR · Decided March 6, 2023

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California accepted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendation in Rodney Carter’s federal habeas corpus proceeding. The court held that Carter’s state-law double-jeopardy claims were not cognizable on federal habeas review and that his related ineffective-assistance claims lacked merit, then dismissed the action with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	March 6, 2023
DOCKET	8:21-cv-01833-JWH-MAR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought federal habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. After reviewing the magistrate judge's Final Report and Recommendation and conducting de novo review of the portions to which Petitioner objected, the district court accepted the recommendation and dismissed the action with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which Petitioner objected.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Rodney Carter v. L. Martinez

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- ineffective assistance of counsel
- state criminal procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Petitioner's claim that his second trial violated California state-law double-jeopardy provisions was cognizable in a federal habeas corpus proceeding.
2. Whether trial or appellate counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to raise Petitioner's state-law double-jeopardy arguments or object to the state court's application of California Penal Code § 1382(a)(2).

HOLDINGS

1. A claim based solely on an alleged violation of state law is not cognizable for federal habeas corpus relief.
2. Counsel is not ineffective for failing to raise meritless state-law arguments.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“federal habeas relief is limited to addressing violations of federal law and does not lie for errors of state law” (2)

“For those reasons, the Court hereby ORDERS that Judgment shall be entered DISMISSING this action with prejudice.” (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner challenged a second state criminal trial, arguing that it violated California's statutory double-jeopardy and speedy-trial provisions, including California Penal Code §§ 1023 and 1382(a)(2). He also alleged that trial and appellate counsel were ineffective for failing to raise those state-law arguments and for failing to object to the state trial court's application of § 1382(a)(2). The district court concluded that the underlying state-law claims were not cognizable on federal habeas review and that counsel was not ineffective for failing to raise meritless claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Carter filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging his state criminal proceedings, including a claimed state-law double-jeopardy violation and ineffective assistance of trial and appellate counsel. The magistrate judge issued a Final Report and Recommendation. The district court reviewed the record and Petitioner's objections, accepted the findings and recommendation generally, and dismissed the action with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Estelle v. McGuire, 502 U.S. 62, 67-68 (1991)
- Juan H. v. Allen, 408 F.3d 1262, 1273-74 (9th Cir. 2005) (as amended)
- Wildman v. Johnson, 261 F.3d 832, 840 (9th Cir. 2001)

