

2008 Oct 24 P 12:14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Quintin Linen, # 238553,	) C/A No. 9:08-3241-CMC-BM
	)
Petitioner,	)
	)
vs.	) Report and Recommendation
	)
Warden, Kirkland R & E Center,	)
	)
Respondent.	)
	)

---

A Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 has been submitted to the Court *pro se* by a state prison inmate. Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Petition pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A, the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

*Pro se* petitions are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leake*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a petition filed by a pro se litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 127 S. Ct. 2197 (2007); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972); *Fine v. City of N.Y.*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1975). However, even when considered under this less stringent standard, the Petition submitted in this case is subject

to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Social Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990). However, even when considered under this less stringent standard, the Petition submitted in this case is subject to summary dismissal.

This is Petitioner's second attempt to challenge his 1997 Charleston County armed robbery conviction and life sentence under § 2254.<sup>1</sup> Petitioner's first case, *Linen v. South Carolina*, Civil Action No. 0:04-2382-CMC, raised three grounds claiming that his 1997 conviction was invalid and unconstitutional and one claim directed to the conditions of his confinement. The petition in that case was considered on the merits and dismissed with prejudice May 4, 2005, and Petitioner's subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals on July 20, 2005. In the present Petition, four additional grounds are asserted for Petitioner's continuing claim that the prosecution and trial that led to his 1997 conviction violated his federal constitutional rights. None of these grounds are based on newly discovered evidence or on a new rule of constitutional law.

Accordingly, the petition filed in this case appears to be a second and successive petition since it raises claims challenging the validity of the 1997 conviction which could have been brought in the first habeas case. *See Gonzalez v. Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 531-32 (2005). However, in his Answers to the Court's Special Interrogatories (Entry 9), Petitioner admits that he did not obtain authorization from the Fourth Circuit before filing this, his second § 2254 case challenging the same conviction and sentence.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Aloe Creme Laboratories, Inc. v. Francine Co.*, 425 F.2d 1295, 1296 (5th Cir. 1970)(a federal court may take judicial notice of the contents of its own records).

Under the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (the “AEDPA”), an individual may not file a second or successive § 2254 petition for a writ of habeas corpus (or the equivalent thereof) or a second or successive § 2255 motion to vacate sentence without first receiving permission to do so from the appropriate circuit court of appeals. *See In re Vial*, 115 F.3d at 1194.<sup>2</sup>

Before a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application.

28 U.S.C. § 2244(3)(A)

Because Petitioner did not obtain authorization from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to file this Petition in the district court, this Court does not have jurisdiction to consider it, and it is subject to summary dismissal without service on the Respondents. *See Romandine v. U. S.*, 206 F.3d 731, 734 (7th Cir. 2000); *U.S. v. Key*, 205 F.3d 773, 774 (5th Cir. 2000); *Hernandez v. Campbell*, 204 F.3d 861, 866 (9th Cir. 2000); *U. S. v. Barrett*, 178 F.3d 34, 41 (1st Cir. 1999); *Lopez v. Douglas*, 141 F.3d 974, 975-76 (10th Cir. 1998); *Williams v. Hopkins*, 130 F.3d 333, 336 (8th Cir. 1997); *Hill v. Hopper*, 112 F.3d 1088, 1089 (11th Cir. 1997). The issue of successiveness of a habeas petition may be raised by the court *sua sponte*. *Rodriguez v. Johnson*, 104 F.3d 694, 697 (5th Cir. 1997); *Anderson v. Bell*, No. 3:06-349, 2006 WL 2559524 (M.D. Tenn. June 15, 2006).


---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner may be able to present a claim for the first time in a successive habeas petition where the claim relies on a new rule of constitutional law, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(A), or, if the claim is based on newly discovered evidence, where the Petitioner can make a *prima facie* showing of both cause and prejudice within the meaning of § 2244(b)(2)(B)(i) and § 2244(b)(2)(B)(ii). *See Evans v. Smith*, 220 F.3d 306, 323 (4th Cir. 2000). Petitioner is advised that “[t]he grant or denial of an authorization by a court of appeals to file a second or successive application shall not be appealable and shall not be the subject of a petition for rehearing or for a writ of certiorari.” § 2244(b)(3)(E).

### RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus in this case be dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process upon Respondent. *See Toney v. Gammon*, 79 F.3d 693, 697 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) (a petition may be summarily dismissed if the record clearly indicates that petitioner's claims are either barred from review or without merit); *Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970) (federal district courts have duty to screen habeas corpus petitions and eliminate burden placed on respondents caused by ordering an unnecessary answer or return).

Petitioner's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

  
Bristow Marchant  
United States Magistrate Judge

October 22, 2008  
Charleston, South Carolina

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
P.O. Box 835  
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *U. S. v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).