

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>DUGLOS ORELLANA-RIVERA,</b>	)	
<b>ID # 47878-177,</b>	)	
<b>Movant,</b>	)	<b>No. 3:16-CV-0570-D</b>
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>No. 3:13-CR-505-D</b>
	)	
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	

**ORDER**

After making an independent review of the pleadings, files, and records in this case, and the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the magistrate judge, the court concludes that the findings and conclusions are correct. It is therefore ordered that the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the magistrate judge are adopted, and movant’s motion to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is denied with prejudice.

Considering the record in this case and pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 22(b), Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 proceedings, and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), the court denies a certificate of appealability. The court adopts and incorporates by reference the magistrate judge’s findings, conclusions, and recommendation filed in this case in support of its finding that the movant has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this court’s “assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong,” or (2) that reasonable jurists would find “it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right” and “debatable whether [this court] was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S.473, 484 (2000).


If movant files a notice of appeal,

( ) movant may proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.

(X) movant must pay the \$505.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

**SO ORDERED.**

March 29, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIDNEY A. FITZWATER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE