

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
JASPER DIVISION

GIRLIS HUGH SERRATT,	)	
	)	
Petitioner	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 6:17-cv-00908-VEH-HNJ
	)	
KARLA JONES, Warden, and THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA,	)	
	)	
Respondents	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

On June 6, 2017, the magistrate judge entered a report and recommendation and allowed the parties therein fourteen (14) days in which to file objections to the magistrate judge's recommendations. On June 11, 2017, petitioner filed objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.

After careful consideration of the record in this case, the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, and the 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 court dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b) and for failure to comply with 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A).

Pursuant to Rule 11 of the *Rules Governing § 2254 Cases*, 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.

The Court will enter a separate order in conformity with this Memorandum Opinion.

**DONE** this 14th day of November, 2017.



---

**VIRGINIA EMERSON HOPKINS**  
United States District Judge