

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

JAMES W. KNIPFER,

Petitioner,

v.

ORDER

TIMOTHY LINDQUIST,

06-C-482-S

Respondent.

---

On October 17, 2006 judgment was entered in the above entitled matter dismissing petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus with prejudice. On October 24, 2006 the Court received a request for a certificate of appealability, a notice of appeal and a request to proceed in forma pauperis from petitioner.

A certificate of appealability may be issued only if the petitioner has shown the denial of a constitutional right. Petitioner has not shown the denial of a constitutional right. Accordingly, petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability will be denied.

\_\_\_\_ In Newlin v. Helman, 123 F.3d 429, 433 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) the United States Court of Appeals discussed the determination of whether an appeal is taken in bad faith as follows:

Frivolousness is an objective inquiry; "good faith" implies a subjective standard. But

judges lack access to the plaintiff's mental processes. Thoughts must be inferred from acts. A plaintiff who has been told that the claim is foreclosed and then files a notice of appeal without offering any argument to undermine the district court's conclusion is acting in bad faith.

Petitioner was advised on October 16, 2006 that in any future proceedings he must offer reasons why his petition should not have been dismissed. He has not provided these reasons. Accordingly, the Court finds that petitioner's appeal is taken in bad faith, and his request to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal will be denied.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is DENIED.

Entered this 26<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

S/

---

JOHN C. SHABAZ  
District Judge