## 1 2 3 4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 JESSE CLYDE BURLESON, No. C 08-01853 SBA (PR) 7 Petitioner, ORDER GRANTING IN FORMA 8 PAUPERIS STATUS; GRANTING PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A 9 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY: CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION. AND TERMINATING REMAINING 10 PENDING MOTIONS AS MOOT Respondent. 11 (Docket nos. 17, 20, 22) 12 13 Petitioner, a state prisoner, has filed a notice of appeal of this Court's judgment dismissing as 14 time-barred his petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner also seeks a 15 certificate of appealability (COA) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) and Federal Rule of Appellate 16 Procedure 22(b). He has also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) on appeal 17 (docket no. 22).1 18 Because reasonable jurists could disagree with this Court's conclusion that Petitioner's 19 application is time-barred, Petitioner's request for a COA is GRANTED. See, e.g., Thomas v. 20 Greiner, 174 F.3d 260, 261 (2d Cir. 1999) (district court may grant certificate of appealability under 21 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) on whether habeas petition is time-barred). 22 For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS Petitioner's request for a COA (docket no. 23 17). Petitioner's application to proceed IFP on appeal (docket no. 22) is GRANTED. 24 The Clerk of the Court shall forward to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals the case file with 25 this Order. See United States v. Asrar, 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997). All remaining pending 26 27 28

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Petitioner previously filed a motion for an extension of time to file his application to proceed IFP on appeal (docket no. 20). Because Petitioner has since filed his application to proceed IFP appeal (docket no. 17), his motion for an extension of time is DENIED as moot.

motions, including his motion for an extension of time to file his application to proceed IFP on appeal (docket no. 20), are terminated as moot.

This Order terminates Docket nos. 17, 20 and 22.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 3/2/10

United States District Judge