A	!
LINITED STATES D	NSTRICT COURT
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
SOUTHERN DISTRIC	CI OF CALIFORNIA
LINITED STATES OF AMERICA	Case No.: 12cr286-MMA-2
, in the second of the second	Related Case No.: 16cv1377
V.	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
MANUEL BORBOA (2),	MOTION FOR VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL;
Defendant.	•
	[Doc. No. 433]
	DISMISSING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO VACATE, SET ASIDE,
	OR CORRECT CONVICTION AND
	SENTENCE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2255
	[Das No. 402]
	[Doc. No. 402]
On May 31, 2012, Defendant Manuel 1	Borboa pleaded guilty to conspiring to
distribute methamphetamine, in violation of	Title 21, United States Code, sections
841(a)(1) and 846. See Doc. No. 138. The C	Court sentenced Defendant to a term of 262
months imprisonment. See Doc. No. 246. O	n June 6, 2016, Defendant, proceeding
through counsel, filed a motion to vacate, set	aside, or correct his conviction and sentence
pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, based on the S	upreme Court's holding in Johnson v.
	UNITED STATES E SOUTHERN DISTRIC UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. MANUEL BORBOA (2), Defendant. On May 31, 2012, Defendant Manuel distribute methamphetamine, in violation of 841(a)(1) and 846. See Doc. No. 138. The Comonths imprisonment. See Doc. No. 246. Othrough counsel, filed a motion to vacate, set

Doc. 3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

United States, 576 U.S. ---, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015), and a related constitutional challenge to Section 4B1.2(a) of the United States Sentencing Guidelines. See Doc. Nos. 402, 404. On March 6, 2017, the Supreme Court ruled that Johnson's holding does not extend to the Sentencing Guidelines, in so far as "the advisory Guidelines are not subject to vagueness challenges under the Due Process Clause." Beckles v. United States, 137 S. Ct. 886, 197 L. Ed. 2d 145 (2017).

Defendant now moves for voluntary dismissal of his 2255 motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a). See Doc. No. 433. Under Beckles, "it plainly appears from the face of the motion" that Defendant "is not entitled to relief." See Rule 4(b) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts. As such, the Court finds that dismissal of Defendant's 2255 motion is appropriate.

Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** Defendant's pending 2255 motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2). The Court **DECLINES** to issue a certificate of appealability. The Clerk of Court is instructed to close the related civil case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: April 7, 2017

HON. MICHAEL M. ANELLO United States District Judge

25

26

27

28

¹ The Court may apply the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to this proceeding as set forth in Rule 12 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts. Defendant moves for dismissal pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i), which provides for dismissal without a court order before the opposing party serves an answer or motion for summary judgment. However, as Defendant acknowledges, the government filed a response to Defendant's 2255 motion. Therefore, dismissal is arguably not appropriate under Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i). Rather, Rule 41(a)(2) applies, which states in pertinent part: "Except as provided in Rule 41(a)(1), an action may be dismissed at the [moving party's] request only by court order . . ."