

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

O'SHAY JOHNSON,

No. 2:08-cv-00496-MCE-KJM P

Petitioner,

vs.

ORDER

D.K. SISTO,

Respondent.

_____ /

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has timely filed a notice of appeal of this court's April 29, 2010 dismissal of his application for a writ of habeas corpus for untimeliness. Before petitioner can appeal this decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

A certificate of appealability may issue under 28 U.S.C. § 2253 “only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The court must either issue a certificate of appealability indicating which issues satisfy the required showing or must state the reasons why such a certificate should not issue. Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

///

///

1 Where, as here, the petition was dismissed on procedural grounds, a certificate of
2 appealability “should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) ‘that jurists of reason would find it
3 debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling’; and (2) ‘that jurists of
4 reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a
5 constitutional right.’” Morris v. Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting Slack v.
6 McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

7 After careful review of the entire record herein, this court finds that petitioner has not
8 satisfied the first requirement for issuance of a certificate of appealability in this case.
9 Specifically, there is no showing that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the
10 petition was timely. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability should not issue in this action.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: June 8, 2010

13
14 
15 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26