

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

GEORGE S. RUSH, III,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

Case No. 08-cv-479-JPG

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner George S. Rush's *pro se* motion for leave to appeal *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 16) and Notice of Appeal (Doc. 14).

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22(b)(1), the Court construes Rush's notice of appeal as a request for a certificate of appealability. *See Ouska v. Cahill-Masching*, 246 F.3d 1036, 1045 (7th Cir. 2001). A § 2255 petitioner may not proceed on appeal without a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1); *see Ouska*, 246 F.3d at 1045.

A certificate of appealability may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *see Tennard v. Dretke*, 542 U.S. 274, 282 (2004); *Ouska*, 246 F.3d at 1045. To make such a showing, the petitioner must "demonstrate that reasonable jurists could debate whether [the] challenge in [the] habeas petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issue presented was adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Ouska*, 246 F.3d at 1046; *accord Tennard*, 542 U.S. at 282; *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (certificate of appealability should issue if the petitioner demonstrates "that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.") The Court finds that Rush has not made such a showing and, accordingly, **declines to issue a certificate of appealability.**

A federal court may permit a party to proceed on appeal without full pre-payment of fees provided the party is indigent and the appeal is taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). A frivolous appeal cannot be made in good faith. *Lee v. Clinton*, 209 F.3d 1025, 1026-27 (7th Cir. 2000). The test for determining if an appeal is in good faith or not frivolous is whether any of the legal points are reasonably arguable on their merits. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989) (citing *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967)); *Walker v. O'Brien*, 216 F.3d 626, 632 (7th Cir. 2000).

The Court is satisfied from Rush's affidavit that he is indigent. Furthermore, the Court does not believe that this action is frivolous or malicious. Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** the motion to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* without prepayment of fees and costs (Doc.16).

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: May 27, 2009

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
DISTRICT JUDGE