1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
6		
7		
8	ANTHONY DAVIS,	
9	Petitioner,	CASE NO. C15-5092 BHS
10	v.	ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR
11	PATRICK GLEBE,	RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT
12	Respondent.	
13		
13 14	This matter comes before the Court on	Petitioner Anthony Davis's ("Davis")
	This matter comes before the Court on second motion for relief from judgment (Dkt.	-
14	second motion for relief from judgment (Dkt.	-
14 15	second motion for relief from judgment (Dkt.	29). Lition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28
14 15 16	second motion for relief from judgment (Dkt. On February 24, 2015, Davis filed a per	29). tition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 ge Strombom issued a Report and
14 15 16 17	second motion for relief from judgment (Dkt. On February 24, 2015, Davis filed a per U.S.C. § 2254. Dkt. 6. On May 4, 2015, Judg	29). tition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 ge Strombom issued a Report and e Court deny Davis's habeas petition
14 15 16 17 18	second motion for relief from judgment (Dkt. On February 24, 2015, Davis filed a per U.S.C. § 2254. Dkt. 6. On May 4, 2015, Judg Recommendation ("R&R") recommending the	29). tition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 ge Strombom issued a Report and e Court deny Davis's habeas petition Davis from challenging his 1986
14 15 16 17 18 19	second motion for relief from judgment (Dkt. On February 24, 2015, Davis filed a per U.S.C. § 2254. Dkt. 6. On May 4, 2015, Judg Recommendation ("R&R") recommending the because Supreme Court precedent precludes D	29). tition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 ge Strombom issued a Report and e Court deny Davis's habeas petition Davis from challenging his 1986 e Court adopted the R&R and denied

ORDER - 1

to review the entire record. Dkt. 24. On October 1, 2015, the Court denied Davis's
motion as frivolous. Dkt. 27.

3 On October 15, 2015, Davis filed another motion for relief from judgment. Dkt. 4 29. This time, Davis argues the Court's denial of his habeas petition deprived Davis of due process and denied him access to the courts. Id. at 5. The Court finds that this 5 6 motion is also frivolous because it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. Therefore, the 7 Court **DENIES** the motion. The Court also declines to issue a certificate of appealability 8 because reasonable jurists would not debate the validity of Davis's motion. See Slack v. 9 McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483–84 (2000). Any other documents filed in this matter will 10 be placed in the case file, but will not be noted for consideration.

11

IT IS SO ORDERED.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Dated this 24th day of November, 2015.

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge