Doc. 30

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on pro se Petitioner Rene Dewayne Manuel ("Petitioner")'s Motions for Relief from Judgment. Dkts. ## 27, 29. The Court issued an Order denying four similar motions on November 15, 2024, and reincorporates the facts as

Petitioner challenges the judgment for being procedural defective pursuant to Gonzalez v. Crosby, 545 U.S. 524 (2005). See Dkts. ## 27, 29. He further asserts that the Court

ORDER - 1

24

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Petitioner makes a typographical error in his citation to this case, highlighting his carelessness in filing this series of motions.

violated the Magistrate Act and Habeas Rule 8(b) by failing to conduct *de novo* review of his Motion for an Evidentiary Hearing. Dkt. # 27 at 1. Petitioner also claims this Court "asserted a procedural defense not made by respondent." Dkt. # 29 at 1.

To the extent Petitioner challenges *de novo* review of any motion filed before the Court adopted the Report, the Court properly considered all pleadings. *See* Dkt. # 14 at 1-2. Furthermore, the Court did not "assert a procedural defense not made by respondent." *See* Dkt. # 29 at 1.

Petitioner has consistently taken advantage of valuable judicial resources by filing a surfeit of meritless motions. He also appears to disregard prior orders. None of the motions alters the uncontested fact that the habeas petition filed in this case is time-barred. The Court will not consider any further filings from Petitioner.

## III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** the pending motions. Dkts. ## 27, 29. The Clerk is **INSTRUCTED** not to accept any further filings in this case.

Dated this 25th day of November, 2024.

The Honorable Richard A. Jones United States District Judge

Richard A Jones