1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8		
9	DEE V. TOWLES,	
10	Petitioner,	Case No. 3:13-cv-00576-RCJ-WGC
11	VS.	<u>ORDER</u>
12	WARDEN BACA, et al.,	
13	Respondents.	
14		
15	The court directed petitioner to show cause why this action should not be dismissed as	
16	untimely. Order (#9). Petitioner has submitted a response.	
17	The court is not persuaded by petitioner's arguments for equitable tolling. Petitioner lists his	
18	family and medical problems, but his judgment of conviction became final twenty-six (26) years,	
19	and the one-year period of limitation expired seventeen (17) years, before he sent his habeas corpus	
20	petition to this court. Unless petitioner was totally incapacitated, and his other allegations show that	
21	he was not, he had the ability to file a federal habeas corpus petition long before he did. Petitioner	
22	also describes his efforts from 1996 to 2006 to obtain parole and from 2005 to 2008 to return to the	
23	state courts. If petitioner was able to pursue these efforts, then he also was able to file a federal	
24	habeas corpus petition long before he did. Ea	quitable tolling is not warranted in this case.
25	Reasonable jurists would not find the court's conclusion to be debatable or wrong, and the	
26	court will not issue a certificate of appealability.	
27	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED with prejudice as untimely.	
28	The clerk of the court shall enter judgment accordingly.	

1	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is DENIED .
2	DATED: This 11 th day of February, 2015
3	$2 \cap$
4	PEDED'T C INNES
5	ROBERT C. JONES United States/District Judge
6	V
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	-2-

I