

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRAVIS BONDURANT	)	Case No.: 10cv1945 AJB (JMA)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND</b>
v.	)	<b>RECOMMENDATION GRANTING</b>
	)	<b>RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO</b>
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF	)	<b>DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE; AND</b>
CALIFORNIA, et al.	)	<b>DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT</b>
	)	<b>OF HABEAS CORPUS</b>
Defendants.	)	

---

[Doc. No. 28.]

On September 8, 2010, Petitioner Travis Bondurant, a prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. (Dkt. No. 1) On September 15, 2010, the case was transferred to the Southern District of California. (Dkt. No. 2 .) On September 22, 2010, the petition was dismissed without prejudice with leave to amend. (Dkt. No. 6.) On November 1, 2010, Petitioner filed a first amended petition for writ of habeas corpus. (Dkt. No. 12.) On February 2, 2011, Respondents filed a motion to dismiss the first amended petition as being time-barred. (Dkt. No. 28.) Petitioner filed an opposition on February 25, 2011. (Dkt. No. 35.) On March 29, 2011, Magistrate Judge Adler filed a report and recommendation recommending that the petition be dismissed with prejudice as being time-barred. (Dkt. No. 45.) On April 18, 2011, Petitioner filed an objection to the report and recommendation. (Dkt. No. 53.)

1 **A. Review of Report and Recommendation**

2 “The district court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report . . . to  
3 which objection is made,” and “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the finding or  
4 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Federal Rule of Civil  
5 Procedure 72(b); United States v. Remsing, 874 F.2d 614, 617 (9th Cir. 1989). However, in the absence  
6 of a timely objection, the Court need “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the  
7 record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory Committee Notes (1983).

8 **B. Discussion**

9 The report and recommendation concluded that the petition for writ of habeas corpus was time-  
10 barred by the one year statute of limitations. The court determined that statutory tolling could not revive  
11 the limitations period that had already ended and that Petitioner had not shown that equitable tolling was  
12 applicable. Although Petitioner filed an objection, he has not provided any legal argument or factual  
13 support disputing the analysis in the report and recommendation. He only states that he was subject to  
14 “duress, coercion, fraud, and undue influence to not file an appeal nor do my petitions timely.” These  
15 arguments were already considered in the report and recommendation. Moreover, he has not presented  
16 any supporting facts to support such an allegation. The report and recommendation discussed Peti-  
17 tioner’s claim of being subject to duress, fraud, coercion and undue influence in determining whether  
18 Petitioner is entitled to equitable tolling. The Court concluded that despite these allegations, Petitioner  
19 was able to file four state court petitions for writ of habeas corpus, an appeal of his criminal conviction,  
20 file a “coherent First Amended Petition and opposition to Respondent’s motion to dismiss within the  
21 deadlines set by the Court.” (Dkt. 45 at 9.) The Magistrate Judge acknowledged Petitioner’s mental  
22 diagnosis of schizophrenia, paranoid type; however, the court concluded that his condition was not of  
23 such severity that Petitioner was unable to rationally or factually understand the need to timely file a  
24 habeas petition. (Id.) After having reviewed the report and recommendation and the objections, the  
25 Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge properly applied the law to this case and adopts the report and  
26 recommendation in full.

27 ////

28 ////

1 **C. Certificate of Appealability**

2 Rule 11 of the Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, “[t]he district court must issue or  
3 deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant.” A certificate of  
4 appealability should be issued only where the petition presents “a substantial showing of the denial of a  
5 constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A certificate of appealability “should issue when the  
6 prisoner shows . . . that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim  
7 of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the  
8 district court was correct in its procedural ruling.” Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).


9 Based on the Court’s review of the petition, the Court finds no issues are debatable among jurists  
10 of reason and that no jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its  
11 procedural ruling. See Slack, 529 U.S. at 484. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability is DENIED as  
12 to the claims in the petition.

13 **Conclusion**

14 After having reviewed the report and recommendation, and the objections, the Court ADOPTS  
15 the Report and Recommendation in its entirety and GRANTS Respondents’ motion to dismiss the  
16 petition for writ of habeas corpus with prejudice and DISMISSES the petition. The Court also DENIES  
17 a certificate of appealability.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19  
20 DATED: August 5, 2011

21   
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia  
24 U.S. District Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28