

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AARON PATRICK MARTIN,
Petitioner,

v.

SUSAN L. HUBBARD, Warden,
Respondent.

1:08-CV-00949 OWW SMS HC

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATION [Doc. #30]

ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S
MOTION TO DISMISS AND DISMISSING
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS [Doc. #19]

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO ENTER JUDGMENT

ORDER DECLINING TO ISSUE
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

On January 13, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a [Findings and Recommendation](#) that recommended Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition be GRANTED and the petition be DISMISSED with prejudice for violating the statute of limitations. The Magistrate Judge further recommended that the Clerk of Court be DIRECTED to enter judgment. The Findings and Recommendation was served on all parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of service of the order.

1 On April 6, 2009, Petitioner filed [objections](#) to the Findings and Recommendation. In
2 accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a *de novo*
3 review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file and having considered the objections,
4 the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation is supported by the
5 record and proper analysis, and there is no need to modify the Findings and Recommendations based
6 on the points raised in the objections.

7 A state prisoner seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a
8 district court's denial of his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. Miller-
9 El v. Cockrell, 123 S.Ct. 1029, 1039 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue
10 a certificate of appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:

11 (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a
12 district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court
of appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is held.

13 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the
14 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
15 validity of such person's detention pending removal proceedings.

16 (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—

17 (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the
18 detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State
court; or

19 (B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.

20 (2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the
21 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

22 (3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which
specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

23 If a court denies a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of appealability
24 "if jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or
25 that jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed
26 further." Miller-El, 123 S.Ct. at 1034; Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). While the
27 petitioner is not required to prove the merits of his case, he must demonstrate "something more than
28 the absence of frivolity or the existence of mere good faith on his . . . part." Miller-El, 123 S.Ct. at

1 1040.

2 In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find the Court's
3 determination that Petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or
4 deserving of encouragement to proceed further. Petitioner has not made the required substantial
5 showing of the denial of a constitutional right. Accordingly, the Court hereby DECLINES to issue a
6 certificate of appealability.

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. The Findings and Recommendation issued January 13, 2009, is ADOPTED IN FULL;
9 2. Respondent's Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED;
10 3. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is DISMISSED with prejudice;
11 4. All pending motions are DISMISSED as moot;
12 5. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to enter judgment for Respondent; and
13 6. The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 **Dated: April 22, 2009**

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE