

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
6

7 **TRAVIS ODELL,**  
8 **Petitioner,**  
9 **v.**  
10 **WARDEN K. KIEBLER,**  
11 **Respondent.**

**CASE NO. 1:21-cv-01508-AWI-HBK (HC)**

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS  
CORPUS, AND DIRECTING CLERK OF  
COURT TO ENTER JUDGMENT AND  
CLOSE CASE**

(Doc. No. 10)

12  
13  
14  
15 Petitioner Travis Odell is a state prisoner proceeding in propria persona with a petition for  
16 writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Doc. No. 1. On November 1, 2021, the  
17 magistrate judge assigned to the case issued findings and recommendations to dismiss the petition.  
18 Doc. No. 10. These findings and recommendations were served on all parties and contained notice  
19 that any objections were to be filed within fourteen days from the date of service of that order. To  
20 date, no objections have been filed.

21 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a  
22 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that  
23 the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

24 In addition, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner  
25 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of his  
26 petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S.  
27 322, 335–36 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate of  
28 appealability provides as follows:

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

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

8 (c)

9 (1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an  
10 appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from—

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

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

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

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

20 28 U.S.C. § 2253.

21 If a court denies a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of  
22 appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.  
23 § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that "reasonable jurists  
24 could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a  
25 different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed  
26 further.'" Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S.  
27 880, 893 & n.4 (1983)).

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

///

///

**ORDER**

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 10) that were issued on November 1, 2021, are ADOPTED in full;
2. Plaintiff's petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. No. 1) is DISMISSED;
3. The Clerk of Court shall ENTER judgment and CLOSE the file; and
4. The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 30, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

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