

(5th Cir. 2004); *see also Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 (1982). In making that substantial showing, 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. If the motion was denied on procedural grounds, movant must show that jurists of reason would find it debatable: (1) whether the motion raises a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Id.* at 484; *Elizalde*, 362 F.3d at 328. 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. 2000).


Movant has not shown that any of the issues raised by his claims are subject to debate among jurists of reason, or that the procedural ruling is incorrect. In addition, the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Movant has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certification of appealability. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability will not be issued.

ORDER

Accordingly, the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct, and the report of the magistrate judge (document no. 9) 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 the **14** day of **March, 2019**.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thad Heartfield", written over a horizontal line.

Thad Heartfield
United States District Judge