EDENEDICK DIONTAE MODDOW

HADSU

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

| FREDERICK DIO  | MIAE MORROW,               | ,                                |                             |           |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Petitioner   | ·<br>·                     |                                  | Undo                        | museu     |
| v.   |                            | No. 3:06-0955<br>Judge Haynes    | the notes                   | n B       |
| WAYNE BRANDO<br>Respondent   | · '                        | )<br>)<br>)                      | 6 NANTER                    | 7. The    |
| WAYNE BRANDON, Warden  Respondent  PETITIONER'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER lary to fell my |                            |                                  |                             |           |
| Pursuant to F  | ed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and l | Habeas Rule 11, petition         | er Frederick Morrow         | deliberry |
|  |                            |                                  | the statute of limitations. |           |
| The Court did not ac   | dress Morrow's argumer     | nt based on $\it Jimenez\ v.\ Q$ | uartermaster, 129 S. Ct.    | . 10 MS   |
| 681 (2009), which h  | as confirmed Morrow's a    | argument as to the date o        | f finality. (R.42,          | We story  |
| Petitioner's Supplen   | nental Response to Statut  | e-of-Limitations Defense         | e (explaining Jimenez's     | 6-29-10   |

## Factual Background<sup>1</sup>

support).) In light of *Jimenez*, this Court should vacate its order dismissing Morrow's petition.

Frederick Morrow appealed his felony-murder conviction to the Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals (TCCA) but was denied relief in December 1998. He was entitled to make a further appeal to the Tennessee Supreme Court through a Rule 11 application. His attorney, however, failed to file the Rule 11 application.

Morrow subsequently pursued state post-conviction relief. In those proceedings, he requested leave to file an out-of-time appeal in the form of a Rule 11 application. In April 2004, the post-conviction judge granted that request, allowing him to file the Rule 11 application.

Case 3:06-cv-00955 Document 49 Filed 02/12/10 Page 1 of 5 PageID #: 3657

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Petitioner has supplied a detailed timeline of events in his Response to Statute-of-Limitations Defense, D.E. 24.