

1. United States Supreme Court
2. Petition for Writ of Certiorari
3. Ewing Redmond Samuels v. David Shinn, et al.

4. INDEX TO APPENDICES

- 5. APPENDIX A - Arizona Court of Appeals, Memorandum Decision
- 6. APPENDIX B - U.S. District Court, District of Arizona, ORDER Denying Habeas Corpus
- 7. APPENDIX C - U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, ORDER Denying COA
- 8. APPENDIX D - Arizona Court of Appeals, Appellant's Opening Brief
- 9. APPENDIX E - Arizona Court of Appeals, Court Docket
- 10. APPENDIX F - Arizona Court of Appeals, Motion for Reconsideration, 4/24/18
- 11. APPENDIX G - Arizona Court of Appeals, ORDER Denying Motion for Reconsideration
- 12. APPENDIX H - Arizona Court of Appeals, Notice of Record
- 13. APPENDIX I - Arizona Supreme Court, Petition for Review
- 14. APPENDIX J - Arizona Supreme Court, ORDER Declines to Accept Jurisdiction
- 15. APPENDIX K - Arizona Court of Appeals, Memorandum Decision
- 16. APPENDIX L - Arizona Court of Appeals, Motion for Reconsideration, 9/30/18
- 17. APPENDIX M - Arizona Court of Appeals, ORDER Denying Motion for Reconsideration
- 18. APPENDIX N - Superior Court of Maricopa County, Notice of Post-Conviction Relief
- 19. APPENDIX O - Superior Court of Maricopa County, ORDER Dismissing Rule 32
- 20. APPENDIX P - Superior Court of Maricopa County, Motion to Dismiss PCR Counsel
- 21. APPENDIX Q - Superior Court of Maricopa County, HEARING

- 1. APPENDIX R - Arizona Court of Appeals, State Court Mandate, Receipt
- 2. APPENDIX S - Superior Court of Maricopa County, Trial Transcript, 1/25/17, pg. 26
- 3. APPENDIX T - Superior Court of Maricopa County, Minute Entry, Trial, 1/25/17
- 4. APPENDIX U - Superior Court of Maricopa County, Trial Transcript, 2/01/17, pg. 95
- 5. APPENDIX V - Detective Marcella Miller, Badge #09423, Criminal History
- 6. APPENDIX W - April Trevor Cud, Criminal History and Arrest Record
- 7. APPENDIX X - Death of Payne Emmett Walker, Report # 2015 00956969
- 8. APPENDIX Y - Proof of Residence and Private Property
- 9. APPENDIX Z - Affidavit of Truth, Facts, and Laws

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

1 United States Supreme Court

2 Petition for Writ of Certiorari

3

4 **APPENDIX-A**

5

6

7

8 The Arizona Court of Appeals

9 Case No. 1 CA-CR 17-0225

10 Memorandum Decision

11 Filed 8-16-2018

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

NOTICE: NOT FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.
UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL
AND MAY BE CITED ONLY AS AUTHORIZED BY RULE.

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF ARIZONA, *Appellee*,

v.

EWING REDMOND SAMUELS, *Appellant*.

No. 1 CA-CR 17-0225

FILED 8-16-2018

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. CR2016-113647-001
The Honorable George H. Foster, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Arizona Attorney General's Office, Phoenix
By Joseph T. Maziarz
Counsel for Appellee

Stephen M. Johnson PC, Phoenix
By Stephen M. Johnson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. SAMUELS
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge David D. Weinzweig delivered the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Michael J. Brown and Judge Maria Elena Cruz joined.

WEINZWEIG, Judge:

¶1 Ewing Redmond Samuels timely appeals from his convictions and sentences for two counts of aggravated assault and one count of unlawful imprisonment. After searching the record on appeal and finding no arguable question of law that was not frivolous, Samuels' counsel filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297 (1969), asking this court to search the record for fundamental error. Samuels had the opportunity to file a supplemental brief but did not do so. After reviewing the entire record, we find no fundamental error and thus affirm Samuels' convictions and sentences.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

¶2 Samuels and his girlfriend, A.H., had an argument at her house in March 2016. Samuels lived at the house, but left after the argument and returned the next morning to retrieve his personal belongings. A.H. was at work when Samuels arrived, but her son ("victim") was inside the house. A.H. asked the victim, who lived nearby, to watch the house and "keep [Samuels] from wrecking stuff." Samuels believed the victim was there to harass him. He thus grabbed his gun from the office and placed it in his waistband.

¶3 An argument ensued between the victim and Samuels. The victim wanted Samuels to return A.H.'s car keys and Samuels wanted A.H. to return his computer. Samuels and the victim exchanged harsh words. The victim taunted Samuels, calling him names. The victim tapped Samuels on the forehead. Samuels pulled out his gun. Samuels yelled about "disrespect" and fired twice at the victim. The first shot hit the victim's leg, shattering his femur and causing him to fall. The second shot sailed over the victim's head.

¶4 Samuels demanded the victim's cellphone, shouting, "You've got three seconds, and I'm going to pop you." Samuels grabbed the

STATE v. SAMUELS
Decision of the Court

cellphone. The victim pleaded with Samuels to call an ambulance. Samuels did not, but instead returned to packing his belongings.

¶5 The victim eventually crawled to the garage in an attempt to escape, but Samuels noticed and ordered him back inside. The victim crawled back and waited in the bathroom. He later escaped, however, when he heard Samuels on the opposite side of the house. He hopped on one leg to a neighbor's house across the street, and the neighbors called police.

¶6 Samuels had a preexisting head injury that the victim knew about. When Samuels was about sixteen years old, a man punched him in the head with a bike chain. He fainted and woke up in the hospital seven days later. The doctors had implanted a titanium alloy mesh into his skull. As a result, he has trouble remembering everyday events and remains vulnerable to further injury. He was told that a second injury to the head would cause brain damage or even death.

¶7 Samuels was indicted on five felony charges, including three counts of aggravated assault, one count of kidnapping and one count of disorderly conduct. The State alleged use of a deadly weapon as an aggravating circumstance.

¶8 The court held an eight-day jury trial. The jury convicted Samuels of three counts: two counts of aggravated assault, both offenses found to be dangerous, and one count of unlawful imprisonment, the lesser-included offense to kidnapping. Samuels argued self-defense. The court sentenced Samuels to two concurrent terms of 7.5 years on the aggravated assault convictions, the presumptive sentence for a first-time offender, and a concurrent one-year sentence on the unlawful imprisonment conviction. He was also given 96 days of presentence incarceration credit.

¶9 Samuels timely appealed. We have jurisdiction pursuant to Ariz. Const. art. 6, § 9, and A.R.S. §§ 12-120.21(A)(1), 13-4031 and 4033(A)(1).

DISCUSSION

¶10 We have read and considered counsel's brief and have reviewed the record for fundamental error. *See Leon*, 104 Ariz. at 300. We find none.

STATE v. SAMUELS
Decision of the Court

¶11 The record reflects Samuels received a fair trial. He was represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings against him. Samuels was also present during the proceedings and waived his presence for a restitution hearing.

¶12 The record reflects the superior court afforded Samuels all his constitutional and statutory rights, and that the proceedings were conducted in accordance with the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure. The court conducted appropriate pretrial hearings, and the evidence presented at trial was sufficient to support the jury's verdicts.

¶13 Samuels sentences fall within the range prescribed by law, with proper credit given for presentence incarceration.

CONCLUSION

¶14 Samuels' convictions and sentences are affirmed. Counsel's obligations in this appeal will end once Samuels is informed of the outcome and his future options, unless, upon review, counsel finds "an issue appropriate for submission" to the Arizona Supreme Court by petition for review. *See State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85 (1984). On the court's own motion, Samuels has 30 days from the date of this decision to proceed with a *pro se* motion for reconsideration or petition for review.



AMY M. WOOD • Clerk of the Court
FILED: AA

1 United States Supreme Court

2 Petition for Writ of Certiorari

3

4

5 **APPENDIX-B**

6

7

8 United States District Court

9 District of Arizona

10 ORDER Denying Habeas Corpus

11 Filed April 17, 2020

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Ewing Redmond Samuels,
10 Petitioner,
11 v.

No. CV-19-02754-PHX-ROS

ORDER

12 Charles L Ryan, et al.,
13 Respondents.
14

15 Magistrate Judge Eileen S. Willet recommends Petitioner Ewing Redmond
16 Samuels' petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied. (Doc. 30). Petitioner filed
17 objections as well as two separate documents titled "Motion for Relief," apparently
18 containing additional objections. (Doc. 31, 32, 35). Respondents then filed a reply,
19 attempting to respond to Petitioner's objections. (Doc. 36). Upon review, the Magistrate
20 Judge's recommendation is correct and the petition will be denied.

21 **BACKGROUND**

22 The factual and procedural history regarding Petitioner's convictions are undisputed
23 but a brief overview is necessary to understand the nature of Petitioner's objections. After
24 a jury trial, Petitioner was convicted in state court of two counts of aggravated assault and
25 one count of unlawful imprisonment. Petitioner was sentenced to a total of 7.5 years'
26 imprisonment. Petitioner filed a direct appeal.

27 On February 7, 2018, Petitioner's appellate counsel filed an *Anders* brief stating he
28 had searched the record but was unable to find an "arguable question of law that [was] not

1 frivolous.” (Doc. 5-1 at 12). The next day, the court of appeals gave Petitioner until March
2 20, 2018, to file a pro se supplemental brief. (Doc. 25-1 at 218). Instead of filing a
3 supplemental brief, Petitioner filed a series of motions complaining about his counsel.

4 On February 20, 2018, Petitioner filed three motions with the court of appeals: a
5 “Motion Objecting to *Anders* Brief”; a “Motion for Stay Pending Preparation of All
6 Records on Appeal”; and a “Motion for the Appointment of New Counsel.” (Doc. 25-1 at
7 218). On February 26, 2018, the court of appeals denied those motions but extended the
8 time for Petitioner to file his supplemental brief until March 30, 2018. Petitioner again
9 chose to file motions instead of a supplemental brief. On March 23, 2018, Petitioner filed
10 a “Motion to Strike *Anders* Brief and Dismiss Unlawfully Appointed Counsel with
11 Irreconcilable Conflict of Interest and Appoint Direct Appeal Counsel.” And on March
12 30, 2018, Petitioner filed a “Motion to Supplement the Record on Appeal and Request to
13 Extend Time to File Supplemental Brief Until the Record is Supplemented.” Those
14 motions were denied on April 5, 2018, and April 11, 2018.

15 On April 24, 2018, Petitioner filed a “Motion for Reconsideration” and a “Notice of
16 Record.” (Doc. 25-1 at 149). The Motion for Reconsideration, although not entirely clear,
17 seemed to argue Petitioner had been denied counsel “for an extended period of time” and
18 Petitioner requested an unidentified additional amount of time to file a supplemental brief.
19 (Doc. 25-1 at 151). The “Notice of Record” presented a list of issues Petitioner wished to
20 have reviewed. Many of the listed issues, however, contained no meaningful identification
21 of the issue Petitioner planned to argue. For example, one issue stated, in its entirety: “The
22 trial judge committed an error of law in the process of reaching a discretionary conclusion,
23 abusing the court’s discretion. State v. Francis, 222 Ariz at 426, 215 P.3d at 400.” (Doc.
24 35 at 15). The court of appeals denied the “Motion for Reconsideration” on May 14, 2018
25 but took no action regarding the “Notice of Record.”

26 On June 8, 2018, Petitioner filed a document with the Arizona Supreme Court titled
27 “Petition for Review.” (Doc. 25-1 at 201). That document argued the court of appeals
28 should have granted Petitioner more time to file his pro se supplemental brief. Petitioner

1 attached his “Direct Appeal Supplemental Brief” to his filing in the Arizona Supreme
 2 Court. (Doc. 25-1 at 205). The Arizona Supreme Court did not take immediate action on
 3 the petition for review. But the brief that Petitioner attached to his Arizona Supreme Court
 4 filing was not filed with the Arizona Court of Appeals. On August 16, 2018, the Arizona
 5 Court of Appeals affirmed Petitioner’s convictions and sentences. (Doc. 5-1 at 18). In
 6 doing so, the court of appeals noted Petitioner had not filed a supplemental brief. The court
 7 of appeals’ decision prompted Petitioner to file yet more motions with that court.

8 On August 31, 2018, Petitioner filed another “Motion for Reconsideration” and on
 9 September 10, 2018, Petitioner filed a “Motion Requesting Permission to Amend Motion
 10 for Reconsideration.” (Doc. 25-1 at 158). It appears Petitioner wished to make minor
 11 changes to the text of his August 31 motion and include additional attachments. (Doc. 25-
 12 1 at 159). One of the proposed additional attachments was a document titled “Issues for
 13 Appellate Review.” (Doc. 25-1 at 170). That document consisted of a list of ten issues
 14 Petitioner wished to raise on appeal. On November 1, 2018, before the court of appeals
 15 acted on Petitioner’s filings, the Arizona Supreme Court denied the petition for review.
 16 (Doc. 25-1 at 208).

17 On December 7, 2018, the court of appeals granted the motion to amend the motion
 18 for reconsideration but then denied the motion for reconsideration itself. (Doc. 25-1 at
 19 200). Petitioner did not seek review by the Arizona Supreme Court. After the conclusion
 20 of his direct review proceedings Petitioner did not pursue post-conviction relief in the trial
 21 court.¹

22 In April 2019, Petitioner filed his federal petition for writ of habeas corpus.
 23 Petitioner then filed several “supplements.” The Court interpreted Petitioner’s numerous
 24 filings as raising five claims related to his convictions:

25 1. Violation of Petitioner’s due process and equal protection rights because the

26
 27 ¹ There were some filings related to a premature post-conviction petition but that premature
 28 petition was dismissed. On December 10, 2018, the superior court granted Petitioner’s
 request to dismiss the counsel that had been appointed to handle his post-conviction relief
 petition. (Doc. 25-1 at 147). Petitioner was allowed to proceed pro se but Petitioner never
 filed a petition for post-conviction relief.

indictment was based on hearsay and perjured testimony.

2. Violation of Petitioner's due process and equal protection rights because the state concealed impeachment and exculpatory evidence.
3. Violation by police officers and prosecutors of Petitioner's due process rights, equal protection rights, privacy rights, and the right to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizures.
4. Violation of Petitioner's due process, equal protection, and Confrontation Clause rights by prosecutorial misconduct.
5. Violation of Petitioner's right to effective assistance of trial and appellate counsel.

(Doc. 9 at 2). Respondents answered the petition and asserted all five of Petitioner's claims were procedurally defaulted without excuse. (Doc. 25). Respondents pointed out that Petitioner had not raised any claims in his direct appeal nor did he raise any claims in a post-conviction relief proceeding. Therefore, Respondents argued the federal petition should be denied on procedural grounds.

On March 6, 2019, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation concluding all of Petitioner’s claims were procedurally defaulted without excuse. Petitioner filed objections as well as a document titled “Motion for Relief” and, a few weeks later, a different document also titled “Motion for Relief.” (Doc. 32, 35). Those latter two documents appear to contain additional objections. Viewing all of his objection-related documents together, it appears Petitioner’s main objection is that he *did* present “four of [his] five claims” to the state court of appeals as “evidenced in his motion for reconsideration.” (Doc. 31 at 10). The motion for reconsideration Petitioner is referencing was filed in September 2018, a month after the Arizona Court of Appeals affirmed his convictions. (Doc. 25-1 at 158). Petitioner also argues that he presented some claims in the petition for review he filed with the Arizona Supreme Court. (Doc. 35 at 4). Finally, Petitioner argues even if he did not exhaust his claims in state court, that failure should be excused.

1 ANALYSIS

2 To properly exhaust his claims, Petitioner was required to present those claims to
3 the Arizona courts in a procedurally proper manner. *See O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S.
4 838, 848 (1999) ("[W]e ask not only whether a prisoner has exhausted his state remedies,
5 but also whether he has *properly* exhausted those remedies"). Under Arizona law,
6 claims that must be raised in a direct appeal must be raised in the opening brief. Failure to
7 do so means those claims are waived. *State v. Guytan*, 968 P.2d 587, 593 (Ariz. Ct. App.
8 1998). By submitting a brief that did not raise *any* claims, Petitioner effectively waived all
9 claims that should have been raised on direct appeal. Petitioner argues he raised his claims
10 by listing them in connection with his motion for reconsideration filed after the court of
11 appeals affirmed his convictions. But Petitioner cites no authority that Arizona law
12 allowed him to wait until after the resolution of his appeal to raise claims in a motion for
13 reconsideration. Petitioner also argues the brief he attached to the petition for review he
14 filed with the Arizona Supreme Court should have been sufficient to raise his claims. But
15 there is no indication that brief was filed with the Arizona Court of Appeals and, in fact,
16 the court of appeals' decision states no such brief was filed. It is undisputed that it is now
17 too late for Petitioner to raise any claims in state court. Therefore, all claims that should
18 have been raised in Petitioner's direct appeal are procedurally defaulted.

19 Petitioner's federal petition asserts a claim for ineffective assistance of trial and
20 appellate counsel. Arizona law did not require that claim be raised on direct appeal. *State*
21 *v. Spreitz*, 39 P.3d 525, 527 (Ariz. 2002) (holding ineffective assistance of counsel claim
22 should not be raised on direct appeal). But Arizona law did require Petitioner raise that
23 claim in a state post-conviction relief petition. *Id.* Petitioner never filed such a petition
24 and it is too late to do so now. Therefore, this claim is also procedurally defaulted.

25 Because Petitioner did not raise his claims in a procedurally proper manner in state
26 court, he cannot pursue them here unless he "can show either cause and prejudice or a
27 fundamental miscarriage of justice." *Clark v. Chappell*, 936 F.3d 944, 982 (9th Cir. 2019).
28 On the "cause" aspect of the "cause and prejudice" inquiry, Petitioner "must show that

1 some objective factor external to the defense impeded [his] efforts to comply with the
2 State's procedural rule." *Davila v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 2058, 2065 (2017). Thus, Petitioner
3 must point to the circumstances that prevented him from filing a brief during his direct
4 appeal or a petition for post-conviction relief after the direct appeal ended. Petitioner
5 appears to argue the Arizona Court of Appeals prevented him from filing a supplemental
6 brief on his direct appeal but that is not accurate.

7 The Arizona Court of Appeals informed Petitioner on February 8, 2018, that he
8 needed to file a supplemental brief no later than March 20, 2018. That deadline was later
9 extended to March 30, 2018. Thus, Petitioner had approximately six weeks to file a
10 supplemental brief. Instead of filing such a brief, Petitioner filed a variety of other motions,
11 mostly complaining about his counsel. Petitioner has never explained why he was unable
12 to file a supplemental brief in the time he was allotted. The Arizona Court of Appeals did
13 not prevent Petitioner from raising his claims on direct appeal.

14 Petitioner also argues he was unable to file a petition for post-conviction relief in
15 state court because there was some confusion about when the Arizona Court of Appeals
16 issued the mandate in his direct appeal. The Court cannot determine how the uncertainty
17 regarding the issuance of the mandate prevented Petitioner from filing a petition in state
18 court.

19 Petitioner has not identified any sufficient "cause" to justify his failure to comply
20 with Arizona's procedural rules. Therefore, Petitioner cannot rely on the "cause and
21 prejudice" exception that would allow this Court to reach the merits of his claims.

22 Petitioner also invokes the "fundamental miscarriage of justice" exception but does
23 not provide any convincing argument related to this exception. (Doc. 31 at 13). This
24 exception requires Petitioner make "a showing of actual innocence." *Gage v. Chappell*,
25 793 F.3d 1159, 1167 (9th Cir. 2015). Attempting to do so, Petitioner cites additional cross-
26 examination topics he believes his counsel should have explored at trial. Merely
27 identifying additional cross-examination, however, falls well short of the required showing
28 to establish actual innocence. *See Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U.S. 298, 321 (1995) (holding

1 “fundamental miscarriage of justice” exception is “rare” and requires an “extraordinary
2 case”).

3 Finally, pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2), “[a]n application for a writ of habeas
4 corpus may be denied on the merits, notwithstanding the failure of the applicant to exhaust
5 the remedies available in the courts of the State.” Looking to the underlying merits of
6 Petitioner’s claims, he would not be entitled to relief even if he had exhausted his claims.
7 In brief, the alleged errors in the indictment process either are not cognizable on federal
8 habeas or, if cognizable, cannot support relief. *See Glazier v. Cate*, No. CV 12-5692-JFW
9 PLA, 2014 WL 6769619, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 1, 2014) (“[E]rrors that occur at a state
10 grand jury proceeding do not deprive a defendant of a federally protected right and are not
11 cognizable on habeas review.”); *Atwood v. Schriro*, 489 F. Supp. 2d 982, 1034 (D. Ariz.
12 2007) (“Because the jury ultimately convicted Petitioner of both charged offenses, any
13 error in the grand jury proceeding connected with the charging decision was harmless
14 beyond a reasonable doubt.”). Petitioner has not identified the material evidence the state
15 failed to disclose that, if disclosed, would have created a reasonable probability of a
16 different result. *See Runningeagle v. Ryan*, 686 F.3d 758, 769 (9th Cir. 2012) (outlining
17 elements of *Brady* claim). Petitioner has not established any violation of his equal
18 protection or due process rights by police officers or prosecutors. And Petitioner has not
19 identified how his trial or appellate counsel performed below the mandated levels and that
20 he suffered prejudice as a result.

21 Accordingly,

22 **IT IS ORDERED** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 30) is **ADOPTED IN**
23 **FULL**. The petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 5) is **DENIED**.

24 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motions for Relief (Doc. 32, 35) are **DENIED**.

25 ...

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** a Certificate of Appealability and leave to proceed
2 in forma pauperis on appeal are **DENIED** because dismissal is justified by a plain
3 procedural bar and jurists of reason would not find the procedural ruling debatable and
4 because the petition does not make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional
5 right.

6 Dated this 17th day of April, 2020.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Honorable Roslyn O. Silver
Senior United States District Judge

1 United States Supreme Court

2 Petition for Writ of Certiorari

3

4

5 **APPENDIX-C**

6

7

8 United States Court of Appeals

9 For the Ninth Circuit

10 ORDER Denying Certificate of Appealability

11 Filed October 1, 2020

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCT 1 2020

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

EWING REDMOND SAMUELS, AKA
Ewing Redmond Samuels III,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE
OF ARIZONA; DAVID SHINN, Director,
Director of the Arizona Department of
Corrections,

Respondents-Appellees.

No. 20-15834

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-02754-ROS
District of Arizona,
Phoenix

ORDER

Before: HAWKINS and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Appellant's motions (Docket Entry Nos. 4 & 5) are construed as a request for a certificate of appealability. So construed, the request for a certificate of appealability is denied because appellant has not shown that "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012).

Any pending motions are denied as moot.

DENIED.