

1 concludes that the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations are supported by the record
2 and proper analysis.

3 In addition, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner
4 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court’s denial of
5 his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537
6 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate of
7 appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows:

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

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

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

17 (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the
18 detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State
19 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
22 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional
23 right.

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

26 If a court denies a petitioner’s petition, the court may only issue a certificate of
27 appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.
28 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that
“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 (1983)).

The Court finds that Petitioner has not made the required substantial showing of the denial

1 of a constitutional right to justify the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Reasonable jurists
2 would not find the Court's determination that Petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas corpus
3 relief debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to proceed further. Thus, the Court
4 declines to issue a certificate of appealability. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 12, 2023, (Doc. 11), are
6 **ADOPTED IN FULL.**
- 7 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.
- 8 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment and close the case.
- 9 4. The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

10 This order terminates the action in its entirety.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: May 16, 2023


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28