1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ALEX BERRERA, No. 2:21-CV-1648-JAM-DMC-P 12 Petitioner, **ORDER** 13 v. 14 CDCR BOARD OF PRISON HEARINGS, et al., 15 Respondents. 16 17 18 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this petition for a writ of 19 habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate 20 Judge pursuant to Eastern District of California local rules. 21 On November 17, 2021, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations 22 herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that the parties may file 23 objections within the time specified therein. No objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed. 24 25 The Court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be 26 supported by the record and by the Magistrate Judge's analysis. /// 27 28 /// 1

1	Pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the
2	Court has considered whether to issue a certificate of appealability. Before Petitioner can appeal
3	this decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P.
4	22(b). Where the petition is denied on the merits, a certificate of appealability may issue under
5	28 U.S.C. § 2253 "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a
6	constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The court must either issue a certificate of
7	appealability indicating which issues satisfy the required showing or must state the reasons why
8	such a certificate should not issue. See Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). Where the petition is dismissed on
9	procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability "should issue if the prisoner can show: (1) 'that
10	jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural
11	ruling'; and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid
12	claim of the denial of a constitutional right." Morris v. Woodford, 229 F.3d 775, 780 (9th Cir.
13	2000) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 120 S.Ct. 1595, 1604 (2000)). For the reasons
14	set forth in the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations, the Court finds that issuance of
15	a certificate of appealability is not warranted in this case.
16	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
17	1. The findings and recommendations filed November 17, 2021, are adopted
18	in full;

- in full;
- 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders;
 - The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability; and 3.
 - The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment and close this file. 4.

Dated: December 22, 2021 24

/s/ John A. Mendez

THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

26

25

19

20

21

22

23

27

28