

## APPENDICES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PENSACOLA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Case Nos.: 3:03cr134/RV/CJK  
3:18cv156/RV/CJK

JAMES VALENTINE,

Defendant.

---

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the court on Defendant's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence by a person in federal custody. (ECF No. 86). While Defendant did not file his motion on the proper court form, Rule 4(b) of these rules provides in part that "[i]f it plainly appears from the motion, any attached exhibits, and the record of prior proceedings that the moving party is not entitled to relief, the judge must dismiss the motion and direct the clerk to notify the moving party." After a review of the record, the undersigned has determined that the motion is untimely and should be dismissed.

BACKGROUND and ANALYSIS

In June of 2006, Defendant James Valentine pleaded guilty to one count of conspiracy to distribute and possess with intent to distribute five kilograms or more  
Case Nos.: 3:03cr134/RV/CJK; 3:18cv156/RV/CJK

APPENDIX -"A"

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

of a mixture and substance containing cocaine. (ECF Nos. 68, 73). On August 30, 2006, the court sentenced Defendant to a term of 240 months' imprisonment, to run concurrently with a sentence imposed by the State of Georgia, followed by ten years of supervised release. (ECF Nos. 76,77). Defendant did not appeal his conviction.<sup>1</sup> He also did not file a postconviction motion pursuant to § 2255 until January 18, 2018—the instant motion.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f) imposes a one-year time limitation on the filing of motions under this section. The one-year period of time runs from the latest of:

- (1) the date on which the judgment of conviction becomes final;
- (2) the date on which the impediment to making a motion created by governmental action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the petitioner was prevented from making a motion by such governmental action;
- (3) the date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if that right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review;
- or
- (4) the date on which the facts supporting the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.

28 U.S.C. § 2255. Because Defendant did not appeal, his judgment of conviction became final on the date on which his time for doing so expired, that is, fourteen

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2015, Defendant filed a motion to modify his sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and Amendment 782 of the United States Sentencing Guidelines, which the court denied. (ECF Nos. 83-85).

Case Nos.: 3:03cr134/RV/CJK; 3:18cv156/RV/CJK

days from the entry of judgment in this case. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(1)(A)(i); Fed. R. App. P. 26(a); *see Mederos v. United States*, 218 F.3d 1252, 1253 (11th Cir. 2000); *Ramirez v. United States*, 146 F. App'x 325 (11th Cir. 2005). Defendant's judgment of conviction became final on September 13, 2006. In order to have been timely filed, his § 2255 motion had to be filed no later than one year from that date, or by September 13, 2007. Therefore, Defendant's motion dated January 16, 2018, and received by the clerk on January 18, 2018, is facially untimely.

Unless Defendant can establish his entitlement to equitable tolling, his motion is time barred. *Jones v. United States*, 304 F.3d 1035, 1038 (11th Cir. 2002) (citing *Akins v. United States*, 204 F.3d 1086, 1089 (11th Cir. 2000)). Equitable tolling is appropriate when a § 2255 motion is untimely because of "extraordinary circumstances that are both beyond [the defendant's] control and unavoidable even with diligence." *Johnson v. United States*, 340 F.3d 1219, 1226 (11th Cir. 2003) (citing *Drew v. Dep't of Corr.*, 297 F.3d 1278, 1286 (11th Cir. 2002); *Sandvik v. United States*, 177 F.3d 1269, 1271 (11th Cir. 1999)). Otherwise stated, "a litigant seeking equitable tolling bears the burden of establishing two elements: (1) that he has been pursuing his rights diligently, and (2) that some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way." *Holland v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 631, 649 (2010) (citation omitted); *Hutchinson v. Florida*, 677 F.3d 1097, 1100 (11th Cir. 2012). It only applies in Case Nos.: 3:03cr134/RV/CJK; 3:18cv156/RV/CJK

"truly extraordinary circumstances." *Johnson*, 340 F.3d at 1226 (citing *Jones*, 304 F.3d at 1039–40; *Drew*, 297 F.3d at 1286). The onus is on the moving defendant to show that he is entitled to this extraordinary relief. *Johnson*, 340 F.3d at 1226, *Jones*, 304 F.3d at 1040. The court will not relieve a petitioner who has sat upon his rights. *United States v. Cicero*, 214 F.3d 199, 203 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (citing *Coleman v. Johnson*, 184 F.3d 398, 402–03 (5th Cir. 1999)). Defendant does not provide any reason to the court for his failure to file his motion for postconviction relief in a timely manner. The court should summarily dismiss Defendant's motion as untimely.

### **CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings provides that "[t]he district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant," and if a certificate is issued "the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2)." A timely notice of appeal must still be filed, even if the court issues a certificate of appealability. Rule 11(b), § 2255 Rules.

After review of the record, the court finds no substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483–84

(2000) (explaining how to satisfy this showing) (citation omitted). Therefore, it is also recommended that the court deny a certificate of appealability in its final order.

The second sentence of new Rule 11(a) provides: "Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue." If there is an objection to this recommendation by either party, that party may bring this argument to the attention of the district judge in the objections permitted to this report and recommendation.

Accordingly, it is respectfully **RECOMMENDED**:

1. Defendant's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence by a person in federal custody (ECF No. 86) be summarily **DENIED and DISMISSED** as untimely.
2. A certificate of appealability be **DENIED**.

At Pensacola, Florida, this 30th day of January, 2018.

/s/ Charles J. Kahn, Jr.  
**CHARLES J. KAHN, JR.**  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

**NOTICE TO THE PARTIES**

Objections to these proposed findings and recommendations must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served a copy thereof. Any different deadline that may appear on the electronic docket is for the court's internal use only, and does not control. A copy of objections shall be served upon all other parties. If a party fails to object to the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations as to any particular claim or issue contained in a report and recommendation, that party waives the right to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on the unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions. *See* 11th Cir. Rule 3-1; 28 U.S.C. § 636.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PENSACOLA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Case Nos.: 3:03cr134/RV/CJK  
3:18cv156/RV/CJK

JAMES VALENTINE,

Defendant.

---

ORDER

This cause comes on for consideration upon the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation dated January 30, 2018 (doc. 87). The parties have been furnished a copy of the Report and Recommendation and have been afforded an opportunity to file objections pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1). I have made a de novo determination of any timely filed objections.

Having considered the Report and Recommendation, and the objections thereto timely filed (doc. 88), I have determined that the Report and Recommendation should be adopted.

Accordingly, it is now ORDERED as follows:

1. The magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation is adopted and incorporated by reference in this order.

APPENDIX-"B"

XXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXX



2. Defendant's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to vacate, set aside, or correct sentence by a person in federal custody (ECF No. 86) is summarily **DENIED and DISMISSED** as untimely.

3. A certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

DONE AND ORDERED this 13th day of February, 2018.

/s/ Roger Vinson

**ROGER VINSON**  
**SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-10859-E

JAMES VALENTINE,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Florida

ORDER:

To merit a certificate of appealability, appellant must show that reasonable jurists would find debatable both (1) the merits of an underlying claim, and (2) the procedural issues that he seeks to raise. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 478 (2000). Because appellant has failed to make the requisite showing, his motion for a certificate of appealability is DENIED.

Appellant's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is DENIED AS MOOT.

/s/ Stanley Marcus  
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

APPENDIX-"C"

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXX

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 18-10859-E

---

JAMES VALENTINE,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Florida

---

Before MARCUS and MARTIN, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

James Valentine has filed a motion for reconsideration of this Court's order dated June 7, 2018, denying his motions for a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in his appeal of the district court's denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion to vacate his sentence. Upon review, Valentine's motion for reconsideration is DENIED because he has offered no new evidence or arguments of merit to warrant relief.

APPENDIX-"D"