



determining whether a plea is voluntary, the court considers all relevant circumstances, including whether the defendant: (1) had notice of the charges against him; (2) understood the constitutional protections he was waiving; and (3) had access to competent counsel. *Id.* Declarations of voluntariness made under oath in open court carry a strong presumption of truth, forming a “formidable barrier in any subsequent collateral proceedings.” *Blackledge v. Allison*, 431 U.S. 63, 73-74 (1977).

The record contains petitioner’s plea of guilty, waiver, stipulation, and judicial confession. The document was signed by plaintiff and acknowledged that he understood his rights, including his right to appeal, and was waiving them by pleading guilty voluntarily. The trial court found that petitioner was mentally competent to enter a plea, was represented by competent counsel, understood the nature of the charge against him, and understood the consequences of pleading guilty. The trial court found that petitioner’s guilty plea was voluntary. Petitioner is not entitled to habeas relief because he has not shown by clear and convincing evidence that the factual finding was wrong. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e).

Petitioner also requests an evidentiary hearing. Because there are no material facts in dispute, an evidentiary hearing is not necessary in this case.

In this case, the 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 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); *see also Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1982). In making that substantial showing, the petitioner 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; *Avila v. Quarterman*, 560 F.3d 299, 304 (5th Cir. 2009). If the petition was denied on procedural grounds, the petitioner must show that jurists of reason would find it debatable: (1) whether the petition raises a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484; *Elizalde*, 362 F.3d at 328. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability is 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 (5th Cir. 2000).

Here, the petitioner has not shown that any of the issues raised by his claims are subject to debate among jurists of reason, or that a procedural ruling was incorrect. In addition, the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Therefore, the petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability.

Accordingly, petitioner's objections (document no. 16) are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct, and the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge (document no. 14) 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 this 13th day of September, 2016.**

  
MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE