Doc. 28 Holmes v. Williams et al 1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 7 8 9 ROBERT HOLMES, III, 10 Petitioner, Case No. 2:12-cv-00354-KJD-RJJ 11 VS. **ORDER** BRIAN WILLIAMS, et al., 12 Respondents. 13 14 15 Before the court is petitioner's motion for relief from judgment (#26) and respondents' opposition (#27). Petitioner again argues that his guilty plea was invalid because the plea agreement 16 stated that he was eligible for probation, but that Nev. Rev. Stat. § 205.060(2) actually barred 17 18 probation. The statute provides, in relevant part: 19 A person who is convicted of burglary and who has previously been convicted of burglary or another crime involving the forcible entry or invasion of a dwelling must not be released on probation or granted a suspension of sentence. 20 Petitioner's new argument is that "forcible entry" is a concept that is completely separate from 21 22 "invasion of a dwelling." The court directs petitioner back to the ruling of Nevada Supreme Court in his own case: "Appellant alleged no other facts indicating that the attempted burglary conviction 23 involved the forcible entry or invasion of a dwelling." Ex. 42, at 2. The Nevada Supreme Court 24 25 interprets § 205.060(2) to bar probation when the person is convicted of a prior crime involving either forcible entry or invasion of a dwelling. The Nevada Supreme Court is the final word on 26 27 interpretations of state law. 28

Reasonable jurists would not find the court's conclusion to be debatable or wrong, and the court will not issue a certificate of appealability.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion for relief from judgment (#26) is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

DATED: January 31, 2014

KENT J. DAWSON United States District Judge