

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

<b>JAMES ARTHUR MEEKS III,</b>	)	
<b>ID #543366,</b>	)	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>No. 3:18-CV-1537-D</b>
	)	
<b>LORIE DAVIS, Director,</b>	)	
<b>Texas Department of Criminal</b>	)	
<b>Justice, Correctional Institutions Division,</b>	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	

**ORDER**

After reviewing *de novo* all relevant matters of record in this case, including the June 28, 2018 findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and petitioner’s July 10, 2018 objections, 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 adopted 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 denied with prejudice as barred by the statute of limitations. Petitioner’s July 10, 2018 request to review cause *de novo* is denied as unnecessary because the court has conducted *de novo* review in this case.

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.**

July 26, 2018.

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