

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FRANK LAGUNAS,
Petitioner,
v.
J. D. HARTLEY, Warden,
Respondent.

) 1:09-cv-02210-LJO-JLT HC
) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
) RECOMMENDATION (Doc. 15)
) ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS
) PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
) (Doc. 14)
) ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT
) OF HABEAS CORPUS (Doc. 1)
) ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO ENTER JUDGMENT

ORDER DECLINING TO ISSUE A
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.

23 On December 21, 2009, Petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus.
24 (Doc. 1). On March 24, 2010, the Court ordered Respondent to file a response. (Doc. 9). On
25 May 21, 2010, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss the petition. (Doc. 14). On July 20, 2010,
26 the Magistrate Judge assigned to the case filed a Findings and Recommendation recommending
27 that Respondent's motion to dismiss be granted and that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be
28 dismissed because Petitioner did not meet the "in custody" requirement of federal habeas law and

1 for failure to allege a claim that would entitle Petitioner to relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. [\(Doc.](#)
2 [15\)](#). This Findings and Recommendation was served on all parties and contained notice that any
3 objections were to be filed within twenty days from the date of service of that order. To date, the
4 parties have not filed timely objections to the Findings and Recommendation.

5 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted
6 a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that
7 the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation is supported by the record and proper
8 analysis.

9 Moreover, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner
10 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of
11 his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. [Miller-El v. Cockrell](#), 537
12 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate
13 of appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:

14 (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a district
15 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.

16 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the validity
17 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.

18 (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--

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

21 (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.

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 denied a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of
24 appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional
25 right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that
26 "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have
27 been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve
28 encouragement to proceed further'." [Slack v. McDaniel](#), 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (*quoting*

1 Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1983)).

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

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. The Findings and Recommendation, filed July 20, 2010 (Doc. 15), is ADOPTED
9 IN FULL;
- 10 2. Respondent's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 14), is GRANTED;
- 11 3. This petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1), is DISMISSED;
- 12 4. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to ENTER JUDGMENT and close the file;
13 and,
- 14 5. The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.

15 This order terminates the action in its entirety.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: August 26, 2010

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

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28