3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
KENNETH ROSHAUN REID,	No. 1:19-cv-00747-DAD-JDP (HC)
Petitioner,	
v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
WARDEN S. LAKE,	(Doc. No. 7)
Respondent.	
7 Petitioner Kenneth Roshaun Reid is a federal prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> and <i>in forma</i>	
8 <i>pauperis</i> with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The matter was	
referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule	
302.	
On September 26, 2019, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and	
recommendations recommending that the pending petition be dismissed as frivolous and for lack	
of jurisdiction because petitioner does not claim his actual innocence and because he previously	
had an unobstructed procedural shot to assert his habeas claims. (Doc. No. 7.) The findings and	
recommendations were served on petitioner and contained notice that any objections thereto were	
to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. ( <i>Id.</i> at 3.) To date, petitioner has not filed	
objections, and the time period for doing so has passed.	
////	1
	FOR THE EASTERN E KENNETH ROSHAUN REID, Petitioner, v. WARDEN S. LAKE, Respondent. Petitioner Kenneth Roshaun Reid is a f <i>pauperis</i> with a petition for writ of habeas corp referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pe 302. On September 26, 2019, the assigned r recommendations recommending that the pener of jurisdiction because petitioner does not clait had an unobstructed procedural shot to assert for recommendations were served on petitioner ar to be filed within fourteen (14) days after server objections, and the time period for doing so had

1	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this		
2	court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the		
3	court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.		
4	In addition, a prisoner seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to		
5	appeal a district court's denial of his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain		
6	6 circumstances. <i>Miller-El v. Cockrell</i> , 537 U.S. 322, 335-36 (2003); 28 U.S.C. § 2253. Rule 11		
7	7 Governing Section 2254 Cases requires that a district court issue or deny a certificate of		
8	8 appealability when entering a final order adverse to a petitioner. <i>See also</i> Ninth Circuit Rule 22-		
9	9 1(a); United States v. Asrar, 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997). Where, as here, the court		
10	denies habeas relief on procedural grounds without reaching the underlying constitutional claims,		
11	1 the court will issue a certificate of appealability "if jurists of reason would find it debatable		
12	2 whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of		
13	3 reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling."		
14	4 <i>Slack v. McDaniel</i> , 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Reasonable jurists would not find the court's		
15	5 decision debatable or conclude that the petition should proceed further. Thus, the court declines		
16	6 to issue a certificate of appealability.		
17	7 Accordingly,		
18	1. The findings and recommendations issued on September 26, 2019 (Doc. No. 7) are		
19	adopted in full;		
20	2. This petition for writ of habeas corpus is dismissed as frivolous and for lack of		
21	jurisdiction; and		
22	3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.		
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
24	Dated: December 2, 2019 Jale A. Jugd		
25	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
26			
27			
28			
	2		