

**United States Court of Appeals**  
For the Seventh Circuit  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted March 3, 2023

Decided March 10, 2023

*Before*

DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*

Nos. 22-2477, 22-2663 & 22-3305

DANIEL E. SALLEY,  
*Petitioner-Appellant,*

*v.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Respondent-Appellee.*

Appeals from the United States District  
Court for the Northern District of  
Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 21-cv-6246

Sharon Johnson Coleman,  
*Judge.*

**ORDER**

Daniel Salley applies for a certificate of appealability to challenge the denial of his motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 and his postjudgment motions. We have reviewed the district court's orders and the record on appeal and find no substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

Accordingly, Salley's requests for a certificate of appealability and any pending motions are **DENIED**.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois – CM/ECF NextGen 1.6.3  
Eastern Division**

USA

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: 1:21-cv-06246

Honorable Sharon Johnson Coleman

Daniel E Salley

Defendant.

---

**NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY**

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Friday, December 9, 2022:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable Sharon Johnson Coleman: Petitioner asks the Court to reconsider its order denying his motion for sanctions [36]. "To establish relief under Rule 59(e), a movant must demonstrate a manifest error of law or fact or present newly discovered evidence." *Vesely v. Armslist LLC*, 762 F.3d 661, 666 (7th Cir. 2014). Petitioner claims that the Seventh Circuit's recent order on his appeal of this Court's denial of his 2255 petition (and subsequent motions for reconsideration) constitutes new evidence warranting reconsideration. See *Salley v. United States*, No. 22-2477 (7th Cir. Oct. 28, 2022). To the contrary, the order addresses only the timeliness of Petitioner's appeal and bears no weight on his motion for sanctions. Because Petitioner has not provided newly discovered evidence relevant to his previously denied motion, his motion for reconsideration [38] is denied. Mailed notice. (ym, )

**ATTENTION:** This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at [www.ilnd.uscourts.gov](http://www.ilnd.uscourts.gov).

# United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit

Chicago, Illinois 60604

May 8, 2023

**Before**

DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*

Nos. 22-2477, 22-2663 & 22-3305

DANIEL E. SALLEY,  
*Petitioner-Appellant,*

*v.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*Respondent-Appellee.*

Appeals from the United States District  
Court for the Northern District of Illinois,  
Eastern Division.

No. 21-cv-6246

Sharon Johnson Coleman,  
*Judge.*

## ORDER

On consideration of the petition for rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc, no judge in regular active service has requested a vote on the petition for rehearing en banc and the judges on the original panel have voted to deny rehearing. It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that the petition for rehearing and petition for rehearing en banc is **DENIED**.