

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

GEORGE VERKLER,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

CASE NO. C17-1876-JCC

MINUTE ORDER

The following minute order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable John C. Coughenour, United States District Judge:

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner’s motion for default judgment (Dkt. No. 21.) On August 4, 2015, the Court sentenced Petitioner to 48 months in custody after he pleaded guilty to two counts of theft of public funds and two counts of aggravated identity theft. (Dkt. No. 1 at 1.) The Ninth Circuit dismissed Petitioner’s direct appeal based on the waiver included in his plea agreement. *United States v. Verkler*, Case No. CR15-0041-JCC, Dkt. Nos. 17 at 15 (W.D. Wash. 2015). Petitioner then filed a second appeal of the Court’s rulings on various post-conviction motions, which the Ninth Circuit dismissed in part as untimely and denied in part as meritless. *Id.*, Dkt. No. 76 at 2. Petitioner subsequently filed a § 2255 motion on December 14, 2017, raising nineteen grounds for relief. (Dkt. No. 1.) The Court dismissed fourteen grounds and ordered service and a response to the remaining five. (Dkt. No. 5.) After receiving the

1 Government’s response, the Court dismissed Petitioner’s remaining five grounds for relief on  
2 June 7, 2018, and entered judgment against Petitioner on June 15, 2018. (Dkt. Nos. 11–12.) Nine  
3 months later, Petitioner tried to appeal the dismissal by filing a motion spanning 372 pages. (Dkt.  
4 No. 16.) The Court explained that Petitioner could not appeal the dismissal without a certificate  
5 of appealability. (Dkt. No. 18 at 1.) The Court therefore construed the appeal as an application  
6 for a certificate of appealability, which the Court denied. (*Id.* at 1–2.)

7 Now, almost two years since the Court dismissed this action, Petitioner has again filed a  
8 motion spanning hundreds of pages in which Petitioner rehashes many of the same arguments  
9 that the Ninth Circuit and the Court have previously rejected. (*See* Dkt. No. 21 at 1–64.) The  
10 Court rejects those arguments for the same reasons that it rejected them before. (*See* Dkt. No. 18  
11 at 1–2.) The motion (Dkt. No. 21) is DENIED.

12 DATED this 29th day of May 2020.

13 William M. McCool  
14 Clerk of Court

15 s/Tomas Hernandez  
16 Deputy Clerk

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26