FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

June 27, 2018

Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

TENTH CIRCUIT

TRAVIS HODSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STEVE REAMS,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 17-1440
(D.C. No. 1:17-CV-00379-LTB)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY[*]

Before **PHILLIPS**, **McKAY**, and **O'BRIEN**, Circuit Judges.

Pro se Appellant Travis Hodson has been charged with a criminal offense in a Colorado state court proceeding. There have been numerous proceedings and delays involving questions concerning his competency to stand trial in that case. He brought this action for *habeas corpus* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 seeking federal intervention in the Colorado case for various alleged mishandlings of the mental competency proceedings. After analyzing the issues, applying the three-factor test governing abstention, as dictated by *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), and considering the narrow exceptions to *Younger*, the district court held that the *Younger* doctrine of

[*] This order is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

abstention applied and that no exceptions were met. Accordingly, the court denied the application without prejudice. It also denied a certificate of appealability because Appellant has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

Appellant filed a motion for relief from judgment, and the district court held that Appellant had not demonstrated an entitlement to relief under Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Appellant asks this court to grant a certificate of appealability so that he may appeal the district court's rulings. He also seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

After reviewing the record and the appropriate cases, we conclude that no reasonable jurist would find the correctness of the district court's decisions debatable. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

We therefore **DENY** a certificate of appealability. We also **DENY** the request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. It is ordered that this appeal be **DISMISSED**. Appellant remains obligated to pay the full amount of the filing fee.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT

Monroe G. McKay
Circuit Judge