

---

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

---

---

TOMMY LOUIS SCOTT,

Petitioner,

*versus*

TDCJ-CID,

Respondent.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:10-CV-90

**MEMORANDUM ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS AND  
ADOPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Petitioner, Tommy Louis Scott, an inmate confined at the James V. Allred Unit of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Keith F. Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The magistrate judge recommends this action be dismissed as barred by the applicable statute of limitations.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge filed pursuant to such referral, along with the record, and pleadings. Petitioner filed objections to the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation. This requires a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and applicable law. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). After careful consideration, the court finds petitioner’s objections lacking in merit.<sup>1</sup> Petitioner’s

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent petitioner wishes to challenge a disciplinary conviction and/or his parole time calculation, petitioner may do so by filing a separate habeas action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

federal petition filed February 9, 2010, over one month past the statutory filing period, is untimely and petitioner has failed to demonstrate any facts entitling him to equitable tolling.

In addition, the court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying post-conviction collateral relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether his claims are time-barred is subject to debate among jurists of reason or worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not issue in this matter.

#### ORDER

Accordingly, petitioner's objections are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct and the report of the magistrate judge is

**ADOPTED.** A final judgment will be entered in this case in accordance with the magistrate judge's recommendation. A certificate of appealability will not be issued.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 11th day of February, 2011.

Handwritten signature of Marcia A. Crone in cursive script.

---

MARCIA A. CRONE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE