Doc. 8

Corpus in the Supreme Court of Guam. See Report at 2, ECF No. 2. That motion was denied on July 18, 2014. Id.

Slightly less than two years later, on July 1, 2016, Tedtaotao filed an Application for Permission to File a Second or Successive Habeas Corpus Petition with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. See Tedtaotao v. United States, Court of Appeals Case No. 16-72252, ECF No. 1. On February 17, 2017, the Ninth Circuit denied that motion as unnecessary, because Tedtaotao's first petition challenging his conviction had been dismissed without adjudication. Id. at ECF No. 2.

On January 26, 2018, Tedtaotao filed the instant Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. Pet., ECF No. 1. This court denied that Petition without reaching the merits, finding that Tedtaotao's claims were barred by the one-year statute of limitations set forth in the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act ("AEDPA"), 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). Order at 2, ECF No. 4.

B. DISCUSSION

The court may issue a COA "only if the applicant has a made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If a court denies the habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the underlying constitutional claims, "a COA should issue when the prisoner shows, at least, [1] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and [2] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 478 (2000).

This court concludes that no "jurists of reason would find it debatable" that this court's procedural ruling was correct. Id. The Petition was filed over three years after the Supreme Court of Guam's decision denying habeas relief, so it exceeded the AEDPA's one-year limitations period. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). Dismissal is therefore warranted. See, e.g., Day v. McDonough,

547 U.S. 198, 202 (2006). Even if a court were to consider equitably tolling the period following Tedtaotao's Application for Permission to File a Second or Successive Habeas Corpus Petition, see Holland v. Florida, 560 U.S. 631, 645 (2010) (holding "that § 2244(d) is subject to equitable tolling in appropriate cases"), that Application was not filed until July 1, 2016, more than a year after the Supreme Court of Guam's decision in July 18, 2014. Thus, Tedtaotao cannot escape the one-year limitations period proscribed by § 2244(d).

As Tedtaotao's request for a certificate of appealability does not satisfy the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the court hereby **DENIES** the Motion.

SO ORDERED.



/s/ Frances M. Tydingco-Gatewood Chief Judge Dated: Apr 22, 2019