

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JASON SAUNDERS,

11 Petitioner,

Case No. 1:07-cv-00525 ALA (HC)

12 vs.

13 JEREMY GARRISON,

14 Respondent.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 On December 12, 2008, this Court denied Petitioner Jason Saunders' ("Petitioner")
17 application for a writ of habeas corpus. (Doc. 35). Petitioner has filed a timely notice of appeal.
18 (Doc. 37). However, before Petitioner can appeal this decision, a certificate of appealability
19 must issue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

20 A certificate of appealability may issue under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) "only if the
21 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. §
22 2253(c)(2). To meet this standard, Petitioner must show: (1) that the issues are debatable among
23 jurists of reason; or (2) that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner; or (3) that the
24 questions are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Lambright v. Stewart*, 220
25 F.3d 1022, 1024-25 (9th Cir. 2000) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000); *Barefoot v.*
26 *Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880 (1983)). Petitioner does not have to show "that he should prevail on the

1 merits [since he] has already failed in that endeavor.” *Lambright*, 220 F.3d at 1025 (citing
2 *Barefoot*, 463 U.S. at 893 n. 4).

3 In his application for a writ of habeas corpus, Petitioner challenged a prison disciplinary
4 hearing that resulted in a loss of credits. In denying his application, this Court found that
5 Petitioner had failed to exhaust his administrative remedies which constituted a procedural
6 default. In the last reasoned decision issued by the state courts, the Fresno County Superior
7 Court reviewed Petitioner’s claims and held that he had “failed to properly exhaust his
8 administrative remedies in a timely manner.” (Doc. 13, Ex. C). Petitioner has failed to rebut the
9 evidence in the record demonstrating that his administrative grievance was properly rejected as
10 untimely. As such, Petitioner’s arguments do not present issues that are debatable among jurists
11 of reason; therefore, this Court will not encourage Petitioner to seek further review. This Court
12 also finds that no other court would resolve the issues presented in a different manner.

13 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that a certificate of appealability shall not
14 issue.

15 /////

16 DATED: January 22, 2009

17 /s/ Arthur L. Alarcón
18 UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE
19 Sitting by Designation
20
21
22
23
24
25
26