

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:17-CV-103 (MTT)**

applicant makes ‘a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.’” Doc. 9 at 6 (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2)). To warrant a COA, a petitioner must make a preliminary showing that “reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)); see also *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003) (“[A] petitioner must sho[w] 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.” (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)). Because Douglas’s petition is denied as procedurally defaulted, the Court finds it necessary to note that, when a claim is denied on procedural grounds, a petitioner must also “demonstrate that a procedural ruling barring relief is itself debatable among jurists of reason; otherwise, the appeal would not ‘deserve encouragement to proceed further.’” *Buck v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 759, 777 (2017) (quoting *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (“[A] COA should issue when the [petitioner] shows, 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.”)). Douglas has not made such a showing and thus the Court agrees that a COA should be denied.

Accordingly, the Recommendation is **ADOPTED as amended** and made the order of this Court. Douglas’s § 2254 petition is **DENIED**, and a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**. Additionally, because there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, an appeal would not be taken in good faith. See 28 U.S.C. §

1915(a)(3). Accordingly, any motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is  
**DENIED.**

**SO ORDERED**, this 18th day of October, 2017.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT