

**In the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Georgia
Savannah Division**

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
BRUNSWICK DIV.
2006 MAR 10 A 11:58

CLERK *J. Taylor*
S.D. GA.

RONNIE WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

v.

4:16-CV-324

MARTIN ALLEN, Warden,

Respondent.

ORDER

Petitioner Ronnie Williams seeks habeas relief for at least the eleventh time.¹ He does not have the necessary authorization from the Eleventh Circuit to do so. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h). This Court therefore lacks jurisdiction to consider his claims, and so his petition is **DISMISSED**. Hill v. Hopper, 112 F.3d 1088, 1089 (11th Cir. 1997) (per curiam); Wilson v. Lanier, No. CV406-99, 2006 WL 2949356 (S.D. Ga. Oct. 16, 2006). To this extent, the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation, dkt. no. 5 is **ADOPTED**.

But the Court **REJECTS** the recommendation that Williams be denied *in forma pauperis* status and sanctioned \$500. Id. at 5. This Court previously told Williams:

¹ Nos. CV416-232 (S.D. Ga.); No. S15H0225 (Ga.); CV414-088 (S.D. Ga.); No. 2013-HC-27-JS (Tatnall Super. Ct.); CV412-019 (S.D. Ga.); CV408-105 (S.D. Ga.); CV405-167 (S.D. Ga.); CV403-069 (S.D. Ga.); CV402-044 (S.D. Ga.); CV495-176 (S.D. Ga.).

In forma paperis [sic] (IFP) status will not . . . be prospectively barred for any future *pro se* pleadings that do not address his claims that he has fully served his twenty year sentence for the 1994 burglary conviction, and he may still file any postconviction claim he wishes if he pays the filing fee

Report & Recommendation, No. CV416-232, Dkt. No. 6 at 5 n.3 (S.D. Ga. Oct. 19, 2016), adopted, Id. Dkt. No. 9 (S.D. Ga. Nov. 7, 2016). Williams's present petition takes issue with the timing and form of his current sentence. Dkt. No. 1 at 5, 7, 12. Those arguments are beyond the scope of the Court's previous warning, so Williams will not be sanctioned for this petition. No. CV416-232, Dkt. No. 6 at 5 n.3. However, Williams is now **WARNED** that any more habeas (or similar) petitions he files without Eleventh Circuit authorization, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h), are extremely likely to be considered vexatious and meet with sanctions.

Finally, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that a Certificate of Appealability and *in forma pauperis* status on appeal are properly **DENIED**.² Dkt. No. 5 at 6.

SO ORDERED, this 10th day of March, 2017.



LISA GODBEY WOOD, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

² The Court does not reach any other issues. See Dkt. No. 5 at 1 n.1, 4 n.2.