judge at the time of issuing the writ shall direct.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 967.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 462 (R.S. § 762).

Section 462 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., was limited to alien prisoners described in section 453 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed. The revised section extends to all cases of all prisoners under State custody or authority, leaving it to the justice or judge to prescribe the notice to State officers, to specify the officer served, and to satisfy himself that such notice has been given.

Provision for making due proof of such service was omitted as unnecessary. The sheriff's or marshal's return is sufficient.

Changes were made in phraseology.

§ 2253. Appeal

- (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is held.
- (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the validity of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or trial a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of such person's detention pending removal proceedings.
- (c)(1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from—
 - (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State court;
 - (B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255.
- (2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.
- (3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2)

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 967; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, §113, 63 Stat. 105; Oct. 31, 1951, ch. 655, §52, 65 Stat. 727; Pub. L. 104–132, title I, §102, Apr. 24, 1996, 110 Stat. 1217.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

1948 ACT

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., §§ 463(a) and 466 (Mar. 10, 1908, ch. 76, 36 [35] Stat. 40; Feb. 13, 1925, ch. 229, §§ 6, 13, 43 Stat. 940, 942; June 29, 1938, ch. 806, 52 Stat. 1232).

This section consolidates paragraph (a) of section 463, and section 466 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed.

The last two sentences of section 463(a) of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., were omitted. They were repeated in section 452 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed. (See reviser's note under section 2241 of this title.)

Changes were made in phraseology.

1949 Act

This section corrects a typographical error in the second paragraph of section 2253 of title 28.

AMENDMENTS

1996—Pub. L. 104-132 reenacted section catchline without change and amended text generally. Prior to amendment, text read as follows:

"In a habeas corpus proceeding before a circuit or district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of appeals for the circuit where the proceeding is had.

"There shall be no right of appeal from such an order in a proceeding to test the validity of a warrant to remove, to another district or place for commitment or trial, a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of his detention pending removal proceedings.

"An appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding where the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State court, unless the justice or judge who rendered the order or a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of probable cause."

1951—Act Oct. 31, 1951, substituted "to remove, to another district or place for commitment or trial, a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the validity of his" for "of removal issued pursuant to section 3042 of Title 18 or the" in second par.

1949—Act May 24, 1949, substituted "3042" for "3041" in second par.

§ 2254. State custody; remedies in Federal courts

- (a) The Supreme Court, a Justice thereof, a circuit judge, or a district court shall entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.
- (b)(1) An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted unless it appears that—
 - (A) the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State; or
 - (B)(i) there is an absence of available State corrective process; or
 - (ii) circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to protect the rights of the applicant.
- (2) An application for a writ of habeas corpus may be denied on the merits, notwithstanding the failure of the applicant to exhaust the remedies available in the courts of the State.
- (3) A State shall not be deemed to have waived the exhaustion requirement or be estopped from reliance upon the requirement unless the State, through counsel, expressly waives the requirement.
- (c) An applicant shall not be deemed to have exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, within the meaning of this section, if he has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented.
- (d) An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted with respect to any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in State court proceedings unless the adjudication of the claim—
 - (1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; or
 - (2) resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceeding.