

---



---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**


---



---

**EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**


---



---

SAMAD SEFIANE,

Petitioner,

*versus*

SHERIFF, JEFFERSON COUNTY,

Respondent.

 §  
 §  
 §  
 §  
 §  
 §  
 §  
 §  
 §  
 §

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:19-CV-90

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Petitioner, Samad Sefiane, an inmate currently confined at the Holiday Unit with the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.<sup>1</sup>

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Zack Hawthorn, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The Magistrate Judge recommends the petition be dismissed for failure to exhaust state court remedies.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge filed pursuant to such referral, along with the record, and pleadings. No Objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed to date.

---

<sup>1</sup>

The petition was filed on a form application for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Petitioner, however, indicates he is challenging a conviction imposed on May 2, 2018 for assault on a family member for which he received a twenty-year sentence. Original Petition, pg. 1 (Dkt. #1). Petitioner also indicates he wishes to file a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. *Id.*, pg. 3.

## ORDER

Accordingly, the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Magistrate Judge are correct, and the report of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED**. The court will enter a Final Judgment in accordance with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.

Furthermore, the Court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying post-conviction collateral relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

In this case, petitioner has not shown that any of the issues would be subject to debate among jurists of reason. The questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed

further. Therefore, the petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of certificate of appealability. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability will not be issued.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 16th day of October, 2019.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marcia A. Crone".

---

MARCIA A. CRONE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE