

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

**JEFFREY S. ANDERSON,**  
**Petitioner,**

v.

**BARRY SMITH, et al.,**  
**Respondents.**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 20-CV-2893**

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2025, upon careful and independent consideration of Petitioner Jeffrey S. Anderson’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and the Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge Carol Sandra Moore Wells, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. Petitioner’s Objections [Doc. 29] are **OVERRULED**.
2. The Petitioner’s motion to correct the record and reconsideration of the Court’s Report and Recommendations [Doc. 26] is **DENIED**.
3. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Carol Sandra Moore Wells [Doc. 23] is **APPROVED and ADOPTED**;
4. Mr. Anderson’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED** with prejudice by separate Judgment, filed contemporaneously with this Order. See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a); Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, Rule 12;
5. No certificate of appealability shall issue under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) because “the applicant has [not] made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right[,]” under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), since he has not demonstrated that “reasonable jurists” would find my “assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see *United States v. Cepero*, 224 F.3d 256, 262-63

(3d Cir. 2000), abrogated on other grounds by *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134 (2012);  
and

4. The Clerk of Court shall mark this file closed.

**BY THE COURT:**

**/s/ Jeffrey L. Schmehl**  
**JEFFREY L. SCHMEHL, J.**