

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Warees Muzakkir,	)	No. CV 10-633-TUC-FRZ (HCE)
Petitioner,	)	<b>ORDER</b>
vs.	)	
Charles L Ryan, et al.,	)	
Respondents.	)	

---

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation issued by United States Magistrate Judge Estrada that recommends denying Petitioner’s habeas petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2254. As throughly explained by Magistrate Judge Estrada, Petitioner is not entitled to relief as his claims are time-barred.<sup>1</sup> As Petitioner’s objections do not undermine the analysis and proper conclusion reached by Magistrate Judge Estrada, Petitioner’s objections are rejected and the Report and Recommendation is adopted.

Before Petitioner can appeal this Court's judgment, a certificate of appealability must issue. See 28 U.S.C. §2253(c) and Fed. R. App. P. 22(b)(1). Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b) requires the district court that rendered a judgment denying the petition

---


<sup>1</sup>The Court reviews de novo the objected-to portions of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The Court reviews for clear error the unobjected-to portions of the Report and Recommendation. *Johnson v. Zema Systems Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999); see also *Conley v. Crabtree*, 14 F. Supp. 2d 1203, 1204 (D. Or. 1998).

1 made pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2254 to "either issue a certificate of appealability or state why  
2 a certificate should not issue." Additionally, 28 U.S.C. §2253(c)(2) provides that a certificate  
3 may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a  
4 constitutional right." In the certificate, the court must indicate which specific issues satisfy  
5 this showing. See 28 U.S.C. §2253(c)(3). A substantial showing is made when the  
6 resolution of an issue of appeal is debatable among reasonable jurists, if courts could resolve  
7 the issues differently, or if the issue deserves further proceedings. See *Slack v. McDaniel*,  
8 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). Upon review of the record in light of the standards for  
9 granting a certificate of appealability, the Court concludes that a certificate shall not issue  
10 as the resolution of the petition is not debatable among reasonable jurists and does not  
11 deserve further proceedings.

12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

- 13 (1) The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 48) is accepted and adopted.  
14 (2) Petitioner's §2254 habeas petition is denied and this case is dismissed with prejudice. All  
15 other pending motions are denied.  
16 (3) A Certificate of Appealability is denied and shall not issue.  
17 (4) The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment accordingly and close the file in this matter.

18  
19 DATED this 13<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2012.

20  
21  
22  
23   
24 Frank R. Zapata  
25 Senior United States District Judge  
26  
27  
28