

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

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| JAMES O'DELL WALTON, |) | |
| ID # 561346, |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| vs. |) | No. 3:16-CV-2211-N |
| |) | |
| LORI DAVIS, Director, |) | |
| Texas Department of Criminal |) | |
| Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and any objections thereto, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court is of the opinion that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court. For the reasons stated in the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, the petition for habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 is **DISMISSED** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction as to the theft conviction claims, and **DENIED** as barred by the statute of limitations as to the parole revocation claims.

In accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) and after considering the record in this case and the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, petitioner is **DENIED** a Certificate of Appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation 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 the petitioner files a notice of appeal, he must pay the \$505.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and a properly signed certificate of inmate trust account.

SIGNED this 9th day of August, 2018.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE