(HC) Torres v. Havilland

Doc. 28

and

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).

Where, as here, the petition was dismissed on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability "should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling'; and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right." Morris v. Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 120 S.Ct. 1595, 1604 (2000)). After careful review of the entire record herein, this court finds that petitioner has not satisfied the first requirement for issuance of a certificate of appealability in this case. Specifically, there is no showing that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether petitioner's petition was timely.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability (Doc. 25) is denied;
- 2. Petitioner's motion for an extension of time (Doc. 26) is denied as unnecessary.

Dated: November 18, 2009

MORRISON C. ENGLAND) JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE