

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 18-15114-B

---

ROLAND A. PRENATT,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,  
ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondents-Appellees.

---

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

---

ORDER:

Roland Albert Prenatt moves for a certificate of appealability ("COA") and leave to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), in order to appeal the district court's denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus petition. In order to obtain a COA, a petitioner must make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the district court denied a habeas petition on procedural grounds, the petitioner must show that jurists of reason would find debatable (1) whether the motion states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quotation marks omitted). Because Prenatt has failed to make the



requisite showing, his motion for a COA is DENIED. His motion for leave to proceed on appeal IFP is DENIED AS MOOT.

  
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 18-15114-B

---

ROLAND A. PRENATT,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,  
ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondents-Appellees.

---

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

---

Before: MARCUS and GRANT, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Roland A. Prenatt has filed a motion for reconsideration, pursuant to 11th Cir. R. 22-1(c) and 27-2, of this Court's order dated May 7, 2019, denying his motions for a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in his appeal from the district court's denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus petition. Because Prenatt has not alleged any points of law or fact that this Court overlooked or misapprehended in denying his motions, his motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

Appendix D-5