

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PANAMA CITY DIVISION**

THOMAS FLOYD CROW,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 5:10cv314-RH/GRJ

SECRETARY, DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER DENYING THE PETITION AND  
DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

This petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 is before the court on the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, ECF No. 19. No objections have been filed. The report and recommendation is correct and is adopted as the court’s opinion.

Rule 11 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases requires a district court to “issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant.” Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), a certificate of appealability may issue “only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 335-38 (2003);

*Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n.4 (1983); *see also Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362, 402-13 (2000) (setting out the standards applicable to a § 2254 petition on the merits). As the Court said in *Slack*:

To obtain a COA under § 2253(c), a habeas prisoner must make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, a demonstration that, under *Barefoot*, includes showing that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were “ ‘adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.’ ”

*Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84 (quoting *Barefoot*, 463 U.S. at 893 n.4). Further, in order to obtain a certificate of appealability when dismissal is based on procedural grounds, a petitioner must show, “at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Id.* at 484.

The petitioner has not made the required showing.

For these reasons,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The report and recommendation is ACCEPTED.
2. The clerk must enter judgment stating, “The petition is DENIED with prejudice.”

3. A certificate of appealability is DENIED.

4. The clerk must close the file.

SO ORDERED on August 31, 2012.

s/Robert L. Hinkle

United States District Judge