

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHEASTERN DIVISION**

RONNIE ALDRIDGE,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 5:14-cv-08037-CLS-HGD
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

On June 30, 2014, the magistrate judge's report and recommendation was entered and the parties were allowed therein fourteen (14) days in which to file objections to the recommendations made by the magistrate judge. On July 22, 2014, petitioner filed untimely objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, which nonetheless will be considered by the court.

After careful consideration of the record in this case, the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, and petitioner's objections thereto, the court hereby ADOPTS the report of the magistrate judge. The court further ACCEPTS the recommendations of the magistrate judge that the Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 be denied.

Pursuant to Rule 11 of the *Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts*, the Court has evaluated the claims within the petition for

suitability for the issuance of a certificate of appealability (COA). See 28 U.S.C. § 2253.

Rule 22(b) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure provides that when an appeal is taken by a petitioner, the district judge who rendered the judgment “shall” either issue a COA or state the reasons why such a certificate should not issue. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), a COA may issue only when the petitioner “has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” This showing can be established by demonstrating that “reasonable jurists could debate whether (or for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner” or that the issues were “adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484, 120 S.Ct. 1595, 1603-04, 146 L.Ed.2d 542 (2000) (citing *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 & n.4, 103 S.Ct. 3383, 3394-95 & n.4, 77 L.Ed.2d 1090 (1983)). For procedural rulings, a COA will issue only if reasonable jurists could debate whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and whether the court’s procedural ruling was correct. *Id.*

The Court finds that reasonable jurists could not debate its resolution of the claims presented in this habeas corpus petition. For the reasons stated in the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the Court **DECLINES** to issue a COA with respect to any claims.

A separate order in conformity with this Memorandum Opinion will be entered contemporaneously herewith.

DONE this 4th day of August, 2014.


United States District Judge