

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION

ANTONIO LEDEL CHISM,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO.4:10-CV-049-Y
	§	
RICK THALER,	§	
Director, T.D.C.J.	§	
Correctional Institutions Div.,	§	

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS  
AND ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

In this action brought by petitioner Antonio Ledel Chism under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, the Court has made an independent review of the following matters in the above-styled and numbered cause:

1. The pleadings and record;
2. The proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States magistrate judge filed on November 1, 2010; and
3. The petitioner's written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States magistrate judge filed on November 19, 2010.

The Court, after **de novo** review, concludes that Petitioner's objections must be overruled, and that the petition for writ of habeas corpus should be dismissed with prejudice as time-barred under 28 U.S.C. § 2244, for the reasons stated in the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions.

Therefore, the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the magistrate judge are ADOPTED.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court notes that although the report correctly notes "Chism's federal petition was due on or before March 18, 2003," (page 4, line 13), it also notes that the limitations period closed on "March 19, 2002" (page 4, line 1). The Court corrects this inconsistency, in that the date reference on page 4, line 1 is March 18, 2003.

Petitioner Antonio Ledel Chism's petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

*Certificate of Appealability*

Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22 provides that an appeal may not proceed unless a certificate of appealability (COA) is issued under 28 U.S.C. § 2253.<sup>2</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings now requires that the Court "must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant."<sup>3</sup> The COA may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right."<sup>4</sup> A petitioner satisfies this standard by showing "that jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or that jurists of reason could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further."<sup>5</sup>

Upon review and consideration of the record in the above-referenced case as to whether petitioner Chism has made a showing that reasonable jurists would question this Court's rulings, the Court determines he has not and that a certificate of appealability should not issue for the reasons stated in the November 1, 2010,

---

<sup>2</sup>See FED. R. APP. P. 22(b).

<sup>3</sup>RULES GOVERNING SECTION 2254 PROCEEDINGS IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS, RULE 11(a) (December 1, 2009).

<sup>4</sup>28 U.S.C.A. § 2253(c)(2)(West 2006).

<sup>5</sup>*Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 326 (2003), citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States  
Magistrate Judge.<sup>6</sup>

Therefore, a certificate of appealability should not issue.

SIGNED November 24, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRY R. MEANS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>6</sup>See FED. R. APP. P. 22(b); see also 28 U.S.C.A. § 2253(c)(2)(West 2006).