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

BEAUMONT DIVISION

ROLANDO CALDERILLA	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:21cv404
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID	§	

MEMORANDUM ORDER OVERRULING PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Petitioner Rolando Calderilla, an inmate confined at the Wynne Unit of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, proceeding *pro se*, brought this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The court referred this matter to the Honorable Christine L. Stetson, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of this court. The Magistrate Judge recommends denying and dismissing the petition.

The court has received and considered the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge filed pursuant to such order, along with the record, pleadings and all available evidence. Petitioner filed objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.

The court conducted a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). After careful consideration, the court concludes petitioner's objections should be overruled.

Petitioner has failed to show trial counsel's actions led him to plead guilty without a full understanding of the nature and consequences of his plea or the charge against him. Federal habeas courts are not an alternative forum for trying facts and issues which were insufficiently developed in state proceedings. *Williams v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 420, 437 (2000). Further, following the Supreme Court's decision in *Cullen v. Pinholster*, federal habeas review under § 2254(d)(1) "is limited to the record that was before the state court that adjudicated the claim on the merits." *Cullen v. Pinholster*, 563 U.S. 170, 181 (2011). Petitioner has not shown that but for counsel's alleged errors he would

not have pleaded guilty and would have insisted on going to trial. *See Hill v. Lockhart*, 474 U.S. 52, 59 (1985).

The presumption of correctness afforded to state court findings applies to both implicit and explicit factual findings. *See Young v. Dretke*, 356 F.3d 616, 629 (5th Cir. 2004); *Valdez v. Cockrell*, 274 F.3d 941, 948 n. 11 (5th Cir. 2001) ("The presumption of correctness not only applies to explicit findings of fact, but it also applies to those unarticulated findings which are necessary to the state court's conclusions of mixed law and fact."). Petitioner has failed to show a violation of his constitutional rights. Further, petitioner has failed to satisfy his burden of proof of rebutting the presumption of correctness afforded the state court's explicit and implicit findings that counsel's conduct was constitutional by clear and convincing evidence, nor has he shown prejudice.

Petitioner has failed to show either that the state court adjudication was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States or that the state court adjudication resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the state court proceeding.

Moreover, petitioner is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying federal habeas corpus relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253; FED. R. APP. P. 22(b). The standard for granting a certificate of appealability, like that for granting a certificate of probable cause to appeal under prior law, requires the movant 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); see also Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1982). In making that substantial showing, the movant need not establish that he should 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 is resolved in favor of the movant, and the severity of the penalty may be considered

in making this determination. See Miller v. Johnson, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir.), cert. denied,

531 U.S. 849 (2000).

Here, petitioner has not shown that any of the issues raised by his claims are subject to debate

among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions advanced by petitioner are not novel and

have been consistently resolved adversely to his position. In addition, the questions presented are

not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Therefore, petitioner has failed to make a sufficient

showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Accordingly, a certificate of

appealability shall not be issued.

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

recommendations.

SIGNED this 30th day of August, 2024.

Michael J. Truncale

United States District Judge

3