Philips v. Brown Doc. 77

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

\_\_\_\_\_

X

GEORGE PHILIPS,

Petitioner,

-against-

**MEMORANDUM** 

Case No. 08-CV-2625 Case No. 08-CV-2626

WILLIAM BROWN,

Respondent.

-----

X

Appearances:

For the Petitioner:

HERALD PRICE FAHRINGER, ESQ.

ERICA DUBNO, ESQ.

Fahringer & Dubno

120 East 56th Street, Suite 1150

New York, NY 10022

GEORGE PHILIPS, pro se

#00AA2299

**Eastern Correctional Facility** 

P.O. Box 338

Napanoch, NY 12458-0338

For the Respondent:

RICHARD BROWN, ESQ.

Queens County District Attorney

125-01 Queens Boulevard

Kew Gardens, NY 11415

By: JOHN CASTELLANO, ESQ.

KAREN WEISS, ESQ.

**Assistant District Attorneys** 

KATHLEEN RICE, ESQ.

Nassau County District Attorney

262 Old Country Road

Mineola, New York 11501

By: JASON WEINSTEIN, ESQ.

MARGARET MAINSUCH, ESQ.

**Assistant District Attorneys** 

## **BLOCK, Senior District Judge:**

On May 23, 2011, the Court denied George Philips's petitions for writs of *habeas corpus* pursuant to 22 U.S.C. § 2254. It did not issue a certificate of appealability because Philips did not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c).

On January 23, 2012, the Court denied Philips's pro se motion for reconsideration

pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(b). Although Philips did not request a

certificate of appealability in connection with his motion, the Second Circuit Clerk's Office has

asked the Court to consider whether to issue one *sua sponte*.

Having carefully reviewed the disposition of Philips's motion, the Court concludes

that the motion did not make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

Accordingly, a certificate of appealability will not issue.

FREDERIC BLOCK

Senior United States District Judge

Brooklyn, New York April 19, 2012

2