Doc. 24 MING v. TENNIS et al

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

JOHN MING,

Petitioner

CIVIL ACTON NO. 06-CV-1673 v.

FRANKLIN TENNIS, et al.,

Respondents.

FILED

ORDER

MAY 28 2015

AND NOW, this

28 day of MAY MICHAEL E. KUNZ, Clerk By \_\_\_\_\_\_Dep. Clerk , 2015, upon consideration of pro se

Petitioner's "Independent Action for Relief From Final Order, or, Alternatively, Motion for Relief from Final Order Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 60(b)," IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. Petitioner's Motion is **DENIED**; and,
- 2. A certificate of appealability will not issue because reasonable jurists would not debate the correctness of this court's procedural ruling. See Slack v. McDaniel, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000).