1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	ARTURO RODRIGUEZ,	Case No. 1:17-cv-00421-LJO-EPG-HC	
12	Petitioner,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION, DISMISSING	
13	V.	PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT	
14	DAVE DAVEY,	TO CLOSE CASE, AND DECLINING TO ISSUE A CERTIFICATE OF	
15	Respondent.	APPEALABILITY	
16		(ECF No. 6)	
17			
18	Petitioner is proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28		
19	U.S.C. § 2254. On May 15, 2017, the Magistra	C C	
20	that recommended the petition be dismissed because it fails to state a cognizable federal habeas		
21	claim. (ECF No. 6). This Findings and Recommendation was served on Petitioner and contained		
22	notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of service of that		
23	order. To date, Petitioner has filed no objections, and the time for doing so has passed.		
24	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted		
25	a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that		
26	the Findings and Recommendation is supported by the record and proper analysis, and there is no		
27	need to modify the Findings and Recommendation.		
28	///		

A state prisoner seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a		
district court's denial of his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances.		
Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 335-36 (2003). The controlling statute in determining		
whether to issue a certificate of appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:		
(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 of appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is hold.		
the proceeding is held.		
(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.		
(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		
appeals from–		
(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		
(B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.		
(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.		
(3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing		
required by paragraph (2).		
A court should issue a certificate of appealability if "reasonable jurists could debate		
whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different		
manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed		
further."" Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S.		
880, 893 & n.4 (1983)). In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find		
the Court's determination that Petitioner's federal habeas corpus petition should be dismissed		
debatable or wrong, or that the issues presented are deserving of encouragement to proceed		
further. Therefore, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.		
///		

I

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
1.	The Findings and Recommendation issued on May 15, 2017 (ECF No. 6) is	
	ADOPTED IN FULL;	
2.	2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED;	
3.	3. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE the case; and	
4.	4. The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.	
IT IS SO ORDERED.		
Dated:	September 6, 2017/s/ Lawrence J. O'NeillUNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE	
	UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE	
	3	
	1. 2. 3. 4. IT IS SO (	