

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

CORNELLUS C. JOHNSON, JR.,	§	
#24987-077,	§	
Petitioner,	§	
v.	§	Civil No. 3:16-CV-1603-D
	§	(Criminal No. 3:93-CR-347-D-1)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	§	
Respondent.	§	

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.

It is therefore ordered that the motion to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is summarily dismissed with prejudice as barred by the one-year statute of limitations. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f); Rule 4(b) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts.

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 petitioner 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 petitioner files a notice of appeal,

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

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

SO ORDERED.

May 30, 2017.



SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE