

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jacoby T. Jackson v. California

Jackson v. California · No. 1:25-cv-0348 JLT SAB (HC) · Decided June 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations and dismissed Jacoby T. Jackson’s 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition as duplicative of a previously filed petition. The court directed the clerk to close the case after Jackson failed to file objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	June 12, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-0348 JLT SAB (HC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations recommending dismissal of a state prisoner's federal habeas petition as duplicative.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) of the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not identified in the source metadata.
PARTIES	Jacoby T. Jackson v. California

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Federal habeas corpus
- Post-conviction relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the petition should be dismissed as duplicative of a previously filed habeas petition.
2. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after the petitioner failed to file objections.

HOLDINGS

1. The habeas petition was properly dismissed as duplicative because it duplicated a previously filed petition pending in another case and did not present new claims warranting treatment as an amendment.
2. After conducting de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the district court properly adopted the findings and recommendations in full.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The petition for writ of habeas corpus is *DISMISSED* as duplicative.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jacoby T. Jackson, a state prisoner, filed a federal habeas petition challenging 2023 convictions for murder, arson, and vehicle theft. The magistrate judge determined that the petition duplicated a previously filed petition pending in Jackson v. Tulare County and that Jackson did not attempt to assert new claims or provide more factual allegations than in the earlier petition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jackson filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging 2023 convictions for murder, arson, and vehicle theft. After preliminary review under Rule 4, the magistrate judge found the petition duplicative of a previously filed petition pending in Jackson v. Tulare County, declined to construe it as an amendment, and recommended dismissal. Jackson filed no objections, and the district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations, dismissed the petition, and ordered the case closed.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

(HC) Jackson v. California

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 JACOBY T. JACKSON, Case No. 1:25-cv-0348 JLT SAB (HC) 12 Petitioner, ORDER

ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING THE
13 v. PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS AS DUPLICATIVE, AND
14 CALIFORNIA, DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COURT TO
CLOSE THE CASE

15 Respondent. (Doc. 7) 16 17 Jacoby T. Jackson is a state prisoner proceeding with a petition for
writ of habeas corpus 18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, seeking to challenge his 2023 convictions
for murder, arson, and 19 vehicle theft. The magistrate judge performed a preliminary review
pursuant to Rule 4 of the 20 Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases and found the petition is
duplicative of a petition currently 21 pending in Jackson v. Tulare County, Case No. 1:25-cv-
00257-SAB. (Doc. 7 at 2-3.) The 22 magistrate judge declined to construe the current petition as
an amendment to the petition in Case.

23 No. 1:25-cv-00257 because Petitioner did “not attempt to raise new claims” and made “fewer
24 factual allegations than the petition currently pending in the previously filed case.” (Id. at 2-3.)
25 Thus, the magistrate judge recommended this petition be dismissed as duplicative. (Id. at 3.) 26
The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Petitioner and notified him that 27 any
objections were due within 30 days. (Doc. 7 at 3.) The Court advised him that the “failure to 28
file any objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s 1
order.” (d., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Petitioner did 2 |
not file objections, and the time to do so has passed. 3 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this
Court performed a de novo review of this case. 4 | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court
concludes the Findings and Recommendations 5 || are supported by the record and proper analysis.
Thus, the Court ORDERS: 6 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on April 25, 2025
(Doc. 7) are 7 ADOPTED in full. 8 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED as
duplicative. 9 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 12
Dated: _ June 12, 2025 Cerin | Tower

TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28