# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY AT LOUISVILLE

### ROBERT MORRIS

v.

### CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:11-CV-211-R

## JACK CONWAY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

#### **OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court for preliminary review of Robert Morris's *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. *See* Rule 4, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts; *Day v. McDonough*, 547 U.S. 198, 209-10 (2006). Because the petition appears to be time-barred, the Court will enter a show cause order.

On May 23, 2008, Petitioner was convicted after pleading guilty in Jefferson Circuit Court (05-CR 1787) to trafficking in methamphetamine, first offense; stealing a motor vehicle registered plate; and burglary in the third degree. Petitioner also claims he was convicted of manufacturing methamphetamine. Petitioner was sentenced to a total of ten years' imprisonment: ten years for trafficking, five years for the plate offense and one year for burglary. Petitioner did not appeal. Petitioner has filed no post-conviction motions in state court.

State prisoners must petition for federal habeas corpus relief, as a general rule, within a one-year limitation period set forth in the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"). "The limitation period shall run from … the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review." 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1) (providing that other circumstances may trigger the clock at a later date, none of which are applicable here).

RESPONDENT

PETITIONER

Petitioner has clearly filed this petition outside the one-year limitation period, 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). Petitioner's conviction became final, for purposes of the AEDPA, thirty days after May 23, 2008, when the time for seeking direct review of the conviction expired. *See* KY. R. CR. PROC. 12.04. Petitioner filed this petition by placing it in the prison mail system on or about March 23, 2011.

Although this petition appears to be time-barred, the question remains whether the Court should excuse Petitioner's failure to file within the limitations period under the doctrine of equitable tolling. To equitably toll the one-year limitation period, the petitioner must show that he has pursued his rights diligently and that extraordinary circumstances impeded his efforts. *Pace v. DiGuglielmo*, 544 U.S. 408, 418 (2005); *see also Griffin v. Rogers*, 399 F.3d 626, 635 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); *Dunlap v. United States*, 250 F.3d 1001, 1008 (6th Cir. 2001).

Therefore, the Court will enter a show cause order requiring Petitioner to address these issues in a written response. The Court being sufficiently advised,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that no later than **30 days** from the entry of this Order, Petitioner must **SHOW CAUSE** why the Court should not dismiss *sua sponte* this petition as time-barred, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). Failure to show cause, in itself, within the time allowed may result in DISMISSAL of this petition.

DATED:

e of Criminal Appeals,
1

4413.007