| Sison v. Sma | all et al | Doc. 24 |
|--------------|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 10 | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | JEFFERSON SISON, |) Civil No. 09-cv-1185-BEN (WVG) |
| 13 | Petitioner, | ORDER DENYING ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY |
| 14 | v. |)) |
| 15 | LARRY SMALL, Warden. | |
| 16 | Respondent. | |
| 17 | | ý – j |
| 18 | Pro se Petitioner Jefferson Sison filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. | |
| 19 | § 2254. The Magistrate Judge recommended denying the petition. The Report and Recommendation | |
| 20 | was adopted on November 18, 2010. On November 30, 2010, Petitioner filed a notice of appeal. He has | |
| 21 | not requested a certificate of appealability for any of the claims presented in his Petition. "[I]f the | |
| 22 | prisoner neglects to request a certificate of appealability before going forward, the court of appeals can | |
| 23 | grant him one sua sponte." Hayward v. Marshall, 603 F.3d 546, 554 (9th Cir. 2010) (en banc, abrogated | |
| 24 | on other grounds by <i>Swarthout v. Cooke</i> , 502 U.S, 2011 WL 197627 (Jan. 24, 2011) (per curiam). | |
| 25 | Here, however, the case has been remanded for the limited purpose of granting or denying the | |
| 26 | certificate. See Order of March 2, 2011, Appeal No. 10-57045. | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |

. .

Legal Standard

A certificate of appealability is authorized, "if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To meet this standard, Petitioner must show that the issues are debatable among reasonable jurists or that the questions are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Hayward*, 603 F.3d at 553. The showing necessitates something above "the absence of frivolity." *Id*.

Discussion

This Court has considered the issues raised by Petitioner with respect to whether they satisfy the standard for issuance of a certificate of appealability, and determines that none meet that standard.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, the Court hereby denies the issuance of a certificate of appealability.

DATED: March 3, 2011

Hon. Roger T. Benitez

United States District Judge