1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	BENJAMIN MELENDREZ WILSON, ) 1:07-CV-01317 OWW GSA HC
11	) Appeal No. 08-17660
12	v. () ORDER DECLINING ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY
13	KATHLEEN ALLISON, Warden,       )         ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT         TO GED VE CONVOE ON DEPONDENCY
14	) TO SERVE COPY OF ORDER ON NINTH Respondent. ) CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS
15	)
16	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with an application for a writ of habeas corpus
17	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.
18	On November 12, 2008, the undersigned issued an order denying the petition on the merits.
19	Petitioner filed a notice of appeal and the appeal was processed to the Ninth Circuit Court of
20	Appeals. On May 4, 2010, the Ninth Circuit remanded the case to this Court for the limited purpose
21	of granting or denying a certificate of appealability. <sup>1</sup>
22	A state prisoner seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a
23	district court's denial of his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. Miller-
24	El v. Cockrell, 123 S.Ct. 1029, 1039 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue
25	a certificate of appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:
26	
27	<sup>1</sup> A certificate of appealability was not issued before the appeal was processed in the first instance because none was required under Ninth Circuit precedent at the time. <u>See White v. Lambert</u> , 370 F.3d 1002, 1004 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.2004); <u>Rosas v.</u>
28	<u>Nielsen</u> , 428 F.3d 1229, 1231-32 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.2005) (per curiam) (no requirement for prisoners to obtain certificate of appealability to review denial of habeas petition challenging administrative decision).

1	(a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court
2	of appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is held.
3 4	(b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the validity of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or trial a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of such person's detention pending removal proceedings.
5	
6	<ul> <li>(c) (1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from-</li> </ul>
7 8	(A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State court; or
9	(B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.
10	(2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.
11	(3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which
12	specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).
13	If a court denies a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of appealability
14	"if jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or
15	that jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed
16	further." Miller-El, 123 S.Ct. at 1034; Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). While the
17	petitioner is not required to prove the merits of his case, he must demonstrate "something more than
18	the absence of frivolity or the existence of mere good faith on his part." Miller-El, 123 S.Ct. at
19	1040.
20	In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find the Court's
21	determination that Petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or
22	deserving of encouragement to proceed further. Petitioner has not made the required substantial
23	showing of the denial of a constitutional right. Accordingly, the Court hereby DECLINES to issue a
24	certificate of appealability.
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.
26	Dated:       June 8, 2010       /s/ Oliver W. Wanger         UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28	
	cd 2