

1

2

3

4

5

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9 || VICTOR D. HOLMES,

Petitioner,

Case No. 3:09-cv-00337-LRH-(RAM)

11 | VS.

12 || GREG SMITH, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

15 The Court dismissed this action because it was untimely. Order (#5). Petitioner has
16 submitted a Notice of Appeal (#9) and a Request for Certificate of Appealability on Dismissal (#7).

17 To appeal the denial of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, Petitioner must obtain a
18 certificate of appealability, after making a “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional
19 right.” 28 U.S.C. §2253(c).

20 Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the
21 merits, the showing required to satisfy §2253(c) is straightforward:
22 The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the
23 district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or
24 wrong. The issue becomes somewhat more complicated where, as
25 here, the district court dismisses the petition based on procedural
26 grounds. We hold as follows: When the district court denies a habeas
petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's
underlying constitutional claim, a COA should issue when the
prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable
whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a
constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable
whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.

27 Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see also James v. Giles, 221 F.3d 1074, 1077-79 (9th
28 Cir. 2000).

1 Petitioner claims that he did not receive anything from the Court from after he mailed his
2 Petition (#4) until he received notification that the action had been dismissed as untimely. Even if
3 true, in the Request (#7) Petitioner does not show cause why the action should not be dismissed as
4 untimely, and he does not present any appealable issues. Petitioner argues that counsel should have
5 been present each time he was re-sentenced, and that he was sentenced in absentia. That argument
6 does not explain why Petitioner took more than the allowable time to file his Petition (#4) in this
7 Court. Reasonable jurists would not disagree with the Court's conclusion.

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Petitioner's Request for Certificate of Appealability on
9 Dismissal (#7) is **DENIED**.

10 DATED this 12th day of November, 2009.



11
12
13 LARRY R. HICKS
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28