

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

DARRELL PECK,

Movant,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent,

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

No. 4:15CV00961 ERW

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on movant's motion to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. The motion appears to be time-barred, and the Court will order movant to show cause why the motion should not be summarily dismissed.

On February 25, 2013, movant pled guilty to two counts of possession of child pornography. On August 1, 2013, the Court sentenced movant to 120 months' imprisonment on each of counts one and two, such terms to be served concurrently. Movant did not appeal.

Rule 4(b) of the Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts provides that a district court may summarily dismiss a § 2255 motion if it plainly appears that the movant is not entitled to relief.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f):

A 1-year period of limitation shall apply to a motion under this section. The limitation period shall run from the latest of--

- (1) the date on which the judgment of conviction becomes final;
- (2) the date on which the impediment to making a motion created by governmental action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the movant was prevented from making a motion by such governmental action;

(3) the date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if that right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or

(4) the date on which the facts supporting the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.

A district court may consider, on its own initiative, whether a habeas action is barred by the statute of limitations. *Day v. McDonough*, 547 U.S. 198, 210 (2006). However, before dismissing a habeas action as time-barred, the court must provide notice to the movant. *Id.*

A review of the instant motion indicates that it is time-barred under 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f)(1), and is subject to summary dismissal. An unappealed criminal judgment becomes final for purposes of calculating the time limit for filing a motion under § 2255 when the time for filing a direct appeal expires. *Moshier v. United States*, 402 F.3d 116, 118 (2nd Cir. 2005). In this case, the judgment became final fourteen days after the judgment was entered on August 1, 2013. Fed. R. App. Proc. 4(b)(1). As a result, the one-year period of limitations under § 2255 expired on August 15, 2013. The instant motion was placed in the prison mail system by movant on June 10, 2015. Therefore, it is time-barred.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Movant makes a conclusory statement that his time limits should be “equitably tolled” because he lacked knowledge of the law, he has a poor memory, his concentration was reduced, his insight and judgment was limited due to his use of prescription medicines and he had ineffective post-conviction counsel. The Court fails to follow this line of argument given that movant was fully cognizant and present at sentencing. The United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit has held that equitable tolling is proper only when extraordinary circumstances beyond a prisoner’s control make it impossible to file a petition on time or when the conduct of the respondent has lulled the movant into inaction. *Jihad v. Hvass*, 267 F.3d 803, 805-06 (8th Cir. 2001). Equitable tolling, however, is “an exceedingly narrow window of relief.” *Id.* at 805. “Pro se status, lack of legal knowledge or legal resources, confusion about or miscalculations of the limitations period, or the failure to recognize the legal ramifications of actions taken in prior post-conviction proceedings are inadequate to warrant equitable tolling.” *Shoemate v. Norris*,

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that movant shall show cause, in writing and no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of this Order, why the instant § 2255 motion should not be dismissed as time-barred.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that if movant fails to comply with this Order, his § 2255 motion will be dismissed.

So Ordered this 23rd day of June, 2015.



---

E. RICHARD WEBBER  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

390 F.3d 595, 598 (8th Cir. 2004); *Kreutzer v. Bowersox*, 231 F.3d 460, 463 (8th Cir. 2000) (holding that “even in the case of an unrepresented prisoner alleging a lack of legal knowledge or legal resources, equitable tolling has not been warranted”).