

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

ROSS THOMAS BRANTLEY, III,	§	
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
v.	§	CIVIL CASE NO. 3:21-CV-1968-D
	§	
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID,	§	
Respondent.	§	

ORDER

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case. No objections were filed. The court reviewed the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the court adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, petitioner’s Rule 60(b) motion, construed as seeking relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, is dismissed without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.

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.

October 28, 2021.



SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
SENIOR JUDGE