

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JUAN JOSE RAMIREZ,)	1:09-cv-01385-LJO-JLT-HC
)	
Petitioner,)	ORDER DENYING
v.)	CERTIFICATE OF
)	APPEALABILITY
KEN CLARK, Warden,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

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

On March 26, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations which were served on all parties and which contained notice that any objections to the Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. (Doc. 16). Petitioner filed objections on April 12, 2010. (Doc. 17). On April 22, 2010, the Court entered an order adopting the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations and dismissing Petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus. (Doc. 18). Judgment was entered on April 22, 2010. (Doc. 19).

On May 14, 2010, Petitioner filed a motion for issuance of a certificate of appealability. (Doc. 20). The requirement that a petitioner seek a certificate of appealability is a gate-keeping mechanism that protects the Court of Appeals from having to devote resources to frivolous issues, while at the same time affording petitioners an opportunity to persuade the Court that, through full briefing and argument, the potential merit of claims may appear. Lambright v.

1 Stewart, 220 F.3d 1022, 1025 (9th Cir. 2000). However, a state prisoner seeking a writ of habeas
2 corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court’s denial of his petition, and an appeal
3 is only allowed in certain circumstances. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003).

4 The controlling statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2253, provides as follows:

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

8 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the validity
9 of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or trial a person
10 charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of such
11 person's detention pending removal proceedings.

12 (c)(1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may
13 not be taken to the court of appeals from--

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

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

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

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

21 Accordingly, final orders issued by a federal district court in habeas corpus proceedings
22 are reviewable by the circuit court of appeals, and, in order to have final orders reviewed, a
23 petitioner must obtain a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253. This Court will issue a
24 certificate of appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a
25 constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must
26 establish that “reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition
27 should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were ‘adequate to
28 deserve encouragement to proceed further.’” Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)
(quoting Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).

29 In the present case, the Court finds that Petitioner has not made the required substantial
30 showing of the denial of a constitutional right to justify the issuance of a certificate of
31 appealability. Reasonable jurists would not find it debatable that Petitioner has not shown an
32 entitlement to federal habeas corpus relief. Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that

1 Petitioner's motion for issuance of a certificate of appealability (Doc. 20), is DENIED.

2

3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 **Dated: June 14, 2010**

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28