

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION

ERNEST JAMES HARRIS

§

VS.

§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:15cv476

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID

§

ORDER ADOPTING THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner Ernest James Harris, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The Court previously referred this matter to the Honorable Keith F. Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, for consideration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. The Magistrate Judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge recommending the petition be denied.

The Court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record and pleadings. No objections to the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge have been filed.

ORDER

Accordingly, 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 denying the petition.

Furthermore, 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 (5th 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 (2000).

In this case, petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether his grounds for review are meritorious is subject to debate among jurists of reason. The questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. The petitioner has therefore failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability will not be issued.

So Ordered and Signed

Jan 10, 2018



Ron Clark, United States District Judge