

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EDWARD C. PETERSON,  
Petitioner,

CIVIL ACTION

v.

WARDEN EDWARD BRENNAN,  
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE  
COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, and  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE  
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
Respondents.

NO. 97-3477

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 9th day of June, 2015, upon consideration of “Motion to Reopen Judgment Under F.R.C.P. 60(b)(6)” filed by *pro se* petitioner, Edward C. Peterson (Document No. 124, filed December 3, 2014), for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum dated June 9, 2015, **IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. “Motion to Reopen Judgment Under F.R.C.P. 60(b)(6)” filed by *pro se* petitioner, Edward C. Peterson, is **DISMISSED AS UNTIMELY FILED**; and,
2. A certificate of appealability will not issue because reasonable jurists would not debate the propriety of this Court’s procedural ruling. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois

---

**DuBOIS, JAN E., J.**